THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02695 7088

524 65

Library

of the
Johns Hopkins University

571 465

Contents.

Donatus, life, f. 1,
works, 2 ff.
Commentary on Terence — history — authorities — editions — special work — condition of Greek words &c. f. 3 – 9.
Archaisms of Terence mentioned by Donatus &c. — authorities — Donatus' idea of an archaism — its definition — periphrases for ἀρχαϊστικός — limit in time of his archaisms — range of authors quoted, and frequency of quotation — number of usages noted — &c. f. 9 – 18,
Plan of arrangement — f. 18, 19,
I Of the sentence in general: — 1, Figures;
A. παρέλκον f. 19 — 40.
B. πλεονασμός — παρομοιωσία, f. 40 — 47.
b. Ellipsis, &c. f. 47 – 52.
A. Figura Etymologica, f. 53. —

2. ἐπιστέλλειν — f. 53 — 55.
3. Position — anim, num, &c. f. 55 — 57.
3. Position — anim, num, &c. f. 57 — 58.
4. Cons. acc. to sense, — f. 59 — 61.
5. Attraction, f. 61 — 63.
6 Old formulae, f. 63 — 66

II. Of single words, &c,

1 words the meaning of which has changed by Inflexion,

Nouns, f. 66 — 69. : Pronouns : f. 69 — 72. : Verbs; 72 — 73 : Adverbs; 73 — 77.

2. words the meaning of which has changed &c,

Nouns : 77 — 83 : Adjectives : 83 — 86 : Verbs, 86 — 97 : Adverbs: 97 — 101.

3. Changes in form ; inflections, &c,

Nouns; 101 — 108 : Adjectives; 108 — 109 : Pronouns; 109 — 111 : Verbs; 111 — 115 : Adverbs; 115 — 119.

4. Peculiarities gender, — f. 119 — 127.

V. Registers :—
Nouns, p. 122 — 126 ; Verbs, 126 —
140 ; Adverbs, 140 — 44 ;
III. General Remarks,
1. Derivation, 144 — 147 ; 2. Orthography, 147 — 150
Conclusion — 150 — 153,

Rune words :— p. 154
words only found in Donat, 154 — 161
Other words, &c. 161 — 4
Life :— 165 — 166

The Archaisms of Terence mentioned in the Donatus Commentary.

Introduction.

In the chronicle of Eusebius at the year, A.D. 374 St Jerome says! - "Victorinus Rhetor et Donatus grammatici, praeceptor meus, Romae insignes habentur."

In his comment on Eccles. ch. 1 St Jerome again calls him "praeceptor meus" and in his Epist. ad. Rufinum 1.16 he again addresses him by the same title and speaks of his commentaries on Terence and Vergil. At the close of the commentary to each play of Terence Donatus is called "Orator urbis Romae". Whether, as is probable the case, he held some official po-

critics, entitling time to that name
on whether he preferred to be
called "orator" i. e. rhetor, rather
than the humbler "grammaticus"
is not settled.

This is all that is known of the
life of Aelius Donatus the gram-
marian and rhetor.

(See Schafer, "De Tempore et
Donato Vitae Interprete" Bonn
1821 pp. 52 pp. ; Teuff. p. 1. ; Teuff-
fel R. L. pp. 959 & 960 ; Ribb. Prol.
Verg. pp. 178 ff.)

Works.

1. A commentary on the poems of
Vergil — certainly the Georgics and
Aenid — probably the Eclogues.
Servius refers to it oftener than
to any other commentary on Vergil,
(twice in the Eclogues, nine times in

the Hec[illegible] and thirty first books in the Aeneid) but otherwise, none of it has been preserved.

(Cf. Keiran, Hist. adv. Rufin 1. 16 ; Serv. Explan. in art. Dan. (Keil 4, 486))

2. An "Ars Grammatica" consisting of two parts — the first, "Ars minor" treating only of the parts of speech (K. 4. 357 – 366) and the second, "Donati Grammatici V. R. Ars Grammatica" in three books (K. 4. 367 – 402) treating the subject more at large. The agreement with Charisius and especially with Diomedes is shown by a use of the same sources. (Teuffel, R. L. 4. 989)

3. A commentary on the plays of Terence, which, barring the "Heauton Timorumenos", has come down to us, in its present condition [illegible]

mentary is evidently a compilation from several others, one of them probably by Evanthius which according to Lexner, (Rh. M. 23, 493) notes of a philosophical or rhetorical character full to the brim of Donatus. As it now stands the commentary of Donatus has evidently been the growth of centuries. Successive generations of scholars have contributed their share. Extracts from other commentators have been added — new and conflicting explanations have been append by men of greater or less intelligence, and finally, to complicate matters still further, a new race of commentators sprung up — interpreters of the notes themselves, which had by this

time become obscure, (cf. Arch. f. Lat. 18 ! 1. 1. 28 ff)
. At last, some one incorporated the whole notes in a work by itself under the name of Donatus. After this the same process of excerpting, addition, contraction and general confusion was again gone through with — the result is the commentary of Donatus as it now stands, (Kempf, Rembach, Hermes 2. 337 ff.)
The fact that the work has not come down to us by itself but has always been confined to whatever blank space was to be found on the margin, i. between the lines of another MS, makes it impossible that we should ever know the exact words of Donatus himself. That we may [illegible]

view we are in possible, although much still remains to be done before that time.

Of the older editions, the best are the Venice (1488) and Westerhovius. The latest edition and at present, the best, is by Reinhold Klotz - in two vols, Leipsig 1838-40. Donatus and Epigraphius are given, with the variants of some of the MSS, and of the earlier editions, notably the Venice and Westerhovius. Much work done in restoring the original reading of the various scholia and in the replacing and sifting of passages either omitted or carelessly treated by previous editors, but very much need however, a new and critical edition embodying the

results of the material which has been slowly accumulating for the past seventy years, beginning with some important contributions by Schaper, "De Ter. et Donato inv. Interprett", diss. Bonn, 1821; "Servius Emended in N. A." Bonn 1826 &c. Several passages were commented upon and a large mass of variant readings and other material of the utmost importance for a new edition was collected, all of which has not been used, but unfortunately Schaper died before his purpose was accomplished. The dissertation of V. Richter, "De Donati Comm. Ter." Bonn 1854 I have not seen. Very important for the text of Donatus is an article

by Rumpfenbach (Hermes 2, 337-402, 1867) 'Die Scholien des Codex Bembinus zum Terentius" which as implied by the title, gives a large number of very important readings from the Bembine, with variants from other MSS and some of the readings of Donatus. (Cf. Dziatzko, Rh. M. 29, 445-462 and 511, Studemund's A. B. 97, 546—571, 1868.)

Of the fragment, "De Comoedia" and the arguments to the several plays, carefully edited by Reifferscheid (Breslau 1875-1877) it seems unnecessary to speak in this paper.

Owing to the general ignorance of the scribes on that subject, the Greek words and quotations in

Donatus are in a deplorable condition. Sometimes a space was left by the scribe to be filled in by some one more conversant with Greek than himself, and it was never done. Often they are confused or mutilated beyond recognition — often omitted altogether with a consequent confusion in the note. Klotz has done something to restore the text but from the nature of the case the task can scarcely be other than hopeless.

So much for a general resumé of the life and work of Donatus, which I have not treated at any length, deeming it more or less foreign to the work now to be considered, namely:—

The Archaisms in Terence mentioned in the Commentary of Donatus.

It is proposed to inquire what Donatus considered an archaism to be, the value of his observations under this head examined by the light of other observations, ancient and modern, in the same field and whether any confusion in the text can be discovered thereby.

Rosenstock ("De Donato Terentii et Servio, Virgilii explicatore, scriptorum Latinorum Interpretibus, 1886) has treated of the sources from which Donatus may have drawn his remarks on orthography. (G. P. 1.)

This is the only work I know of

that approaches the subject under consideration.

What Donatus understands to be an archaism may be gathered from a comparison of the various passages where he uses "ἀρχαϊστικός", "veteres dicebant" or some similar expression. In commenting on 'ornati' (Eun. 2,2,6) Donatus says: "Et ornati: et ornati: antiquus genetivus". Especially important is the Schol. Bemb. 3d hand to the same passage: "— — nos dicimus, 'huius ornatus'. Ceterum archaismus est, id est, antiquitas exigit 'huius ornati'. Sic alibi, 'nihil ornati, nihil tumulti'. Et Sallustius, "igitur senati decreto."" The quotation 'nihil ornati &c" is from Andria 2, 2, 28 where

Donatus has the note :- " -- 'Hδ-
λεύθησεν. See Valentine: 'ei, qe
penulti decuntur' &c. Compare Hec.
3.2.21.: "Antiqui sic declinabant
tinnitus, tinnati, ut Valentinus &c'
and Phorm. 1.3.2. where Prol.
2.2.28 is again referred to.
An archaism then is an obsolete
or old-fashioned usage or turn
of expression considered, as will
be seen from the examples, from
the point of view of Donatus, not
of Terence: that is, whenever the
speaker of an archaism Donatus
calls attention to something old
fashioned in his own time. That
such a "paranomasia verborum tinnitus"
as Terence should have made a
conscious use of archaisms is
of course out of the question.

Donatus uses a number of equivalents or periphrases for the word 'ἀναγκαῖος.' We have no thought however of making any distinction, but uses them either indifferently or for the sake of variety, as can be easily shown. For instance: in Eun. 3, V. 39; 4, 3, 2: Adel. V. 4, V. he calls the "figura etymologica" "ἀναγκαῖος," in Pharm. Prol. 19, "naturale". In Adel. V. 3, V. V. he uses both "ἀναγκαῖος" and "non natures diuersum" (cf. Pharm. 1, 2, 80). Eun. 2, 3, 82, "natures gratulisse (gratulatur)" and Eun. 4, 4, 11 "antiqua locutio" of the same thing. And so, if it were worthwhile, the comparison might be continued.

It has been shown, I think,

of equivalents for ἀρχαῖος are
[illegible], 'ancient' or
'ancient or distant', the latter
often of some opinion held by the
ancients themselves. Twice the
participle 'dicens' (Aud. 4.4.36, 1.1.28)
Ἀρχαῖος itself occurs something
like a [illegible], occasionally,
like the others, accompanied by some
qualifying expression. Ἀρχαίως
occurs once (Nec. 1.2.110) and 'olim'
once (Nec 1.2.7), 'apud veteres'
(Ultimus), or "retinta", "antiqua"
"retenta declinatio", or ἔλλειψις, vet-
eres fuerunt, dicebant, declinabant,
addebant, [illegible],
iungebant, figurabant, loquebantur,
ligerunt, usitatum veteribus, usi-
tatum est veteribus dicere, ve-
teres or antiqua locutio, sic veteres

locutionem non nec dicimus," "ut veteres valent loqui", "sic veteres," "sic veteres dicere malunt", "secundum veteres or antiquos", "antiqui dicebant", "in veteribus invenitur", "hae veteres ait", "antiqua dicitur, dixit or locutus est", "sic frequenter veteres", "antiquorum more dixit", "sic veteres — nos, or quod nos", "nos dicimus", "quod or quae nos," "quod nos tantum", & "veteribus nos placet."

As far as may be judged from an investigation of his notes on this ~~behalf~~ subject, most of the usages which Donatus terms archaisms, because such, roughly speaking, about the beginning of the Empire, for fact, before that time, many of them had passed over to the facts or to

Such conscious archaists as Tallent, that certain of them are to be found in late authors like Pronto or Gellius goes rather to prove that they were felt as archaisms at that time, than that they were a part of the living language. Gellius and his contemporaries like a certain class of writers today were very fond of striking out strife with the borrowed finery of the oldentime.

It is of interest to notice the authors which Donatus quotes from for illustrations of archaic usage. It will be noticed that none of these outlived suggestion.

Most frequently quoted of course, is Vergil and nearly always the Aeneid, naturally, being more archaic in style

than either the Eclogues or the Georgics
(Aeneid 10, 641 : 10, 719 : 1, 595 : 3, 183 :
12, 610 : 4, 93 : 2, 85 : 6, 768 : 8, 148 : 8, 117 :
3, 685 : 4, 597. Eclogues 3, 1 : 1, 30 : 6, 47 :
3, 102 of whatever Hagen I. B. 14, 472, 1868,
The Georgics are not quoted)
Naevius (Bell. Pun.) ; Ennius (Annal.
& medica) ; Plautus (Fab. Epid. Trin.) ;
Pacuvius ; Accius ; Caecilius ; Lucil-
ius ; Cato ; Pomponius ; Varro ; Tubero ;
Lucretius ; Cicero ; Sallust & anee Hor-
ace. Of course it does not follow
that Lucretius read all the authors he
quotes ~~from~~ nor as in case of Nonius,
most of the quotations used by the
Latin grammarians have grown gray
in the service.

Altogether there are about one hund-
red and forty notices in Lucretius
of older usage, embracing a variety

of subjects. For convenience, although the division cannot be rigidly exclusive, they may be classed under the following general heads:—

I. Of the sentence in general.

1. Figures &c.

A. παρέλκον

B. παράφρασις — παρονομασία.

C. ἔλλειψις &c.

D. "Figures Etymologiques"

E. ἑπιστρέλευτον.

F. Irony.

2. Position

3. Construction acc. to [illegible]

4. Attraction

5. Old formulae

II. Nouns, adjectives and pronouns &c.

1. words absolute,

2. words changed in [illegible]

3. Peculiarities in form, gender &c.
4. Syntax

III. General —

1. Derivation.
2. Orthography &c.

Following the order proposed, let us begin then with the figures which [illegible] upon us in the [illegible]

On the general subject of figures in Sanatrug Kalen has written two important articles: "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Lehrsätze des Bonner Zweig Vereins" Prog. Halberstadt 1870 & 1872. Special treatises will be mentioned in their proper places.

A. ΠΡΟΣΩΔΙΑ.

(See Kalen Prog. 1872 p. 4)

Under this category, the confusion is something discouraging. At least

three, if not more, ~~[illegible]~~ can be detected. Most of the notes containing such expressions as "abundat", "abundanter", "ex abundanti" and the like, doubtless belong here. In certain notes, as will be seen below, παρέλκον is looked upon simply as an element of style, with reference to some expressions as for instance, "plerique omnes" a second commentator disputes this view in the expression, the reason is not παρέλκον but ἀρχαϊστικόν. Still a third tries to reconcile the two opposing views by saying that the expression is both — παρέλκον and ἀρχαϊστικόν. From this last seems to be drawn the inference, visible in certain notes, presumably by a fourth ~~[illegible]~~, that παρ-

ἔλκειν whereas it may mean much whatever its character, is in itself an archaism. Παρέλκον includes everything "abundans" whether a fault or an element of concision and, in the phrase pleonasmus, perissologia and tautologia of Donatus (Thes Gram.) to which it partly corresponds, refer only to a faulty fullness. The Scholiast finally goes so far as to take παρέλκον over into rhetoric and make it a regular figure of speech. (Im Rahmen [illegible] xxx.)

First let us consider "pleriqui omnes" (Quint, I, 1, 28). The first note in any discussion of the παρέλκον theory:- "Haec adiectio dicitur, in primo positu loco. Adiectiones vero sunt in

prima parte orationis aut in
ultima adiecuntur. Hic ergo
"Plerique" de abundantia positum
est; "omnes" vero necessaria
additum est. Et alibi "celer-
ces plus oti" (Eun 1, 2, 5). In
ultimo, dicunt; "intus hoc,
intus ibi." (Then follows a note
on another point introduced by the
opponent of the πλείων theory:-)
"Ἀρχαϊσμὸς est. Nam errant qui
"Plerique" πλείων intelligunt
aut qui subdistinguunt "Plerique"
et dic inquiunt "omnes". Hoc
enim prima parte orationis
dixere veteres. Eodem modo Graeci πάμπολλα et Latini "plus oti."
(quoting from Nonius B. P.). Then
a third note follows, evidently by
a third hand, which seems to mean

the two opposing theories by: —
"Figurate Florentius παράλκον
τῆι [illegible]".

The first note, as it stands, is
obscure (i.e. "Here adiectio — pos-
itu loco."). For "dicitur" a
predicate noun is wanted, which
is suggested by the sentence be-
low "sensum qui 'dicitur' παρ-
άλκον intelligunt de". We have then
proposed to read, "Hic adiectio
dicitur παράλκον in primo pos-
itu loco". The sentence, "Adiectio-
nes — adiciuntur" is the ad-
dition of another scholiast to the
expression "in primo positu
loco" which he misunderstood.
So too of "hic ergo — additum
est." The first note then, in
its original shape would read:

somewhat as follows :- " Here
adhactio [illegible] περὶ ΚΝΕΦ is
prima positio loco. Et alibi;
"calvaeco plus patio", In ultimo;
interna loci, 'intimi'. This simi-
lipicis matters wonderfully.
In Pharm. 1, 3, 20 / "plerique omnes", according to Wakin, we
again meet the writer of the first
note to And 1, 1, 28, in the words;
"πλησίον testium" (referring to
And. 1, 1, 28), again followed by
his opponent with the words :-
'Et sic ἐγχείρεσι ut "plus patio"
. Pharm. 1, 3, 20). For the materials
thus we, I see no reason [illegible]
the view of And. 1, 1, 28 would
not be the writer of it.
The first and second commentar-
ies are again met with in Eu-

I, 2, 5, 46. ; "Now, and intelligible &c" ; No 2. "Now, and intelligible, glow later &c"

writers of comments like the following must have drawn the conclusion from the [illegible] that all ἑξ. οἱ παράλλειν were ἀναλογίαν, Pharm. V, 8, 11) Adde ἐστιν καὶ. "τῷ ἀχαιρεῖ addidit adhuc quum patiuisset diuc hoc integer δεκαεν ἐστε." Cum. V, 8, 5,) Scin me, "Cum suppiecret scin, Ergo nec abundat et est pigm ἀχαιρεῖ. Cf. Schol. ad Hom. I, 1, 116 (Schaefer) (Hermes 2, 338 ff.), For a full list of the ἑξ. in Donatus called παράλλον see Halm 1872, p. 5 ff., This development in the theory of παράλλοντα will throw some light on notes to be

talk in up further on.

Now let us enquire into the value of the comment above quoted, Is "plerique omnes" an archaism? Does it count as one word or is it an example of so-called 'παρέγκλισις'?

The expression may have been an doubtless was, at all periods common in the familiar language. That it was decidedly old-fashioned in the literary language, however its origin is to be explained, seems to be amply proved by the examples of its use, for instance: Ter. Pharm. 172; Caecil. 66 (plerique omnia); Plaut. Trin 29 (cf. Brix). It is unfortunate that we have lost the passage in Ennius (8, 12) which

treats especially of this question.
The titulus however shows
that he looked upon it as an
archaism and as a single word,
"Quid significet in veterum li-
bris scriptum 'plerique omnes';
et quod ea verba accepta a Grae-
cis videntur". It would ap-
pear that the writer of note 2-
(And 1,1,28) either drew his in-
formation from Gellius or from
the same source with him. The
remark "Eadem modo Graeci πάμ-
πολλά &c" looks as if it might
correspond with something in
Gellius under the head of; "quod
ea verba accepta a Graecis vi-
dentur;"
Gellius uses the expression fre-
quently; (1,8,2; 1,7,4; 4,17,4; 14,3,

1, 21, 1; IV, 7, 1; 1, 3, 2,. In 10, 2 V, 4 the singular "plerique omnis" In 19, 12, 1, "plurimi omnes" - cf Hofp. III, 7, 189; Plaut Trin 1048 where however Brix reads "plerisque omnibus omnium")

Whatever was the origin of "plerique omnes", the ellipsis, if there ever was any omission e.g. [illegible] the expression was practically used as a single word. (Compare our colloquial "most all")

In "plura dicta" (Vell. 1, 1, 4; Hunt. 1, 2, 2 V) the ellipsis of quam is unusual.

"Intribi" occurs six times in Suetonius, once in Aframius and again comes to the surface in Hofpellius. In Gellius 3, 7, 1

the preferred reading is the classic "interim."
(Du Brix Miles 104; Lorenz Mil 104 & Most. Introd ch. 31 note. For "plerique omnes", Dem. Merg. A. 1, 181; Sperg. Rud. 55 (2d ed.); Dziatzko Pharm 172; Brix Trin. 29.)
That "interea loci" is a parallel to "plerique omnes" except as an archaism is doubtful. I find it only in Plautus, Terence and Pacuvius. Plaut. Men. 446; Pseud. 255; Ter. Eun. 716; 255; Haut. 2-3-116; Pacuv. (Ribb. ch. 71)
(Cf. Lorenz Pseud. 255.)

Rud. 1, 3, 18) Ex obiit mortem.
"Plinc dixit quod non 'obiit' tantum, ut Vergilius: 'morte obita" &c (A. 10, 641)

Donatus' statement seems to be fairly correct when submitted to the test of examples.

"Mortem obire", itself a euphemism, is old-fashioned or poetic. According to the general meaning of the Romans regarding death in later times the expressions were still poetic. Mortem to "obire". No examples show however, both obire and obire mortem were used as simply as Plautus,

Mortem obire, Plaut. Aul. fr. 2 IV: Cic. Phil. V. 17, 48: Sent 38, 83: Ch diem supremum obire &c. Plaut Cist. 1.3.27: Sulp. ap. Cic. Fam 4.12.2.: Gell. 6.8.6: Sent sent. 1.

Obeo alone, with or without &

manner of death is well represented:- Plaut. Pers. 2, 4, 76; Plaut. Stich. 3, 1, 45; Horace, Livy, Pliny, Vellein, Sueton. Tacit. Eutrapius &c.

Andria 3, V, 8) "Quid me — faciam". "Plautinus casus est, sed non 'quid faciam', uterque antiquus addebant". (So Klotz after the Bembine edit. Codd. add, omit "sed non Ruf.")

Quid me faciam &c. is a conversational usage. The ablative is generally used, sometimes the dative, rarely the ablative with de

Plaut. Plaut Mostell. 3, 2, 102; Cas. V, 4, 6; V, 4, 9, &c. Ter. Haut 462; Cic. Sest 13, 29; Verr. 2, 2, 16, 40 &c.; Livius; Cic. Tusc. II, 30; Ac 2, 30.

96 &c. Hor. Sat. 1, 1, 63,
&c. Plaut Epid 1, 2, 48 ; Ter. Ad
V. 9, 39 ; Nepos Them. 2,

It appears from the exx. this
idiom was confined largely to
Cicero and the comic writers.
That it was so freely used by
the latter shows it to have been
a favorite of the people, among
whom from its nature it must
have remained long after its
disappearance from literature
(See Sjöng. Stud. 3rd, 8 ; Lorenz
Most. 638 ; 435 ; Schmalz, Ant.
Gram. p. 280 n. 6)

Lucr. 1, 5, 1) Nemo homo est,
" Dramatic for " nemo " homo
intellegatur tamen addidit " ho-
mo " ut uterque solent rei ex re-

[illegible]

Next we have two passages [illegible]
views. [illegible]:-

Adel. 2.3.6) Hominī nemini.
"Non necessarium [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] commentatoribus [illegible],
Nam quum "nemini" homini ne-
gificat quid opus fuit dicere,
"hominī nemini"? Sed ut dixi-
mus figura est ἀοχαίρεός,
(That donative ever called ἀοχαίρεός a "figura" is more than doubtful)
The comment at Eun. 3, V. 1 was
perhaps added on account of the
"ut diximus" at Adel. 2.3.6. The
connection of the two is evident.
Compare Charis. (K. 1. 46, 15) who
comments on the same usage and
quotes Lucilius and Eun. 3, V. 1
It would [illegible]

notes came from the same source
the source from which Charisius
and Donatus drew their material.
With the foregoing compare the
comments on "genium hominum"
Pharm. 2, 1, 62 ; "homini ad-
dixerit illo" And. V, 1, 9 where the
quotation from Ballista is identical
with the one in Ph. 2, 1, 62
Compare also the comments on
nemo quisquam and nihil quic-
quam, both favorite expressions
in the familiar speech and frequent
in Comedy (Dz. Phorm. 80)
And. [illegible] ; cf Eun [illegible] ; Hec.
[illegible] ; Pharm [illegible] ;
The use of homo as noted above,
is a characteristic of the language of
conversation too well known to
call for further notice

(Cf. Agiatzko Abel. 259; Ph. 591
Holtze 1, 243 fe)

(Adel. 2, 2, 16) Praeterea autem,
Hyperides set figura. Then what
seems to be the addition of a later
hand: "Nam interea libenter eam
inactionem multiplicabant."
The point of the note seems to be
the pleonastic use of autem, the
frequent employment of which, even
in direct questions is a characteristic
of Comedy and of Cicero,
especially in the philosophical
writings where the conversational
method is so much employed,
owing to the more sedate character
of their work autem was
much less used by [illegible],
especially Tacitus (see Lehmann

(p. 306 and 403)

Acts, V, 9, 1) "Δυο δίδι!"
"Non "Δυο" sed "Δυο δίδι" moraliter ut et utrique valent loqui."
"Expressively, and also as the ancients used to speak." In both counts the commentator is correct.
This doubling of the pronoun is ante and post classic and col. loquial — consequently frequent in the Comic writers.
It is a pleonastic expression, or as the commentator would probably say; "ΠΛΕΟΝΑΣΤΙΚΟΝ" — to be found in all three persons, oftenest in the third. Plautus and Terence use it and Cicero in the Epistles and earlier works. It does not appear again until the Hellenistic

(See Schmalz 402 par 63, 2.)
Plaut Poen. F. 2. 1332 ; Pers. L. 3. 1. ;
Capt 411 3 ; Mile v 3. 1. 88 &c.
&c ie Phil 2, 37, 96 : Colum. R. R.
12. 7 ; 12. 41. Then in late Latin :-
Gell. V 12, 6 ; 12. 1. 6 ; Typical. Ins. 1.
104, 35 ; 106. 31 ; 4, 157, 7 &c. Lactant
2, V. 6 &c.
(Cf. Dziatz. Adel. 958 ; Brix Trin.
156 ; Haltze 1, 30 c)

Pharm. 1, 2, 86) Omnia haec,
"non ex abundanti fecit sed oratorie quasi tam multa. Et est
χαχίσμός. Nam post enumerationem veteres hoc dicebant. Salustius in Iugurtha (85)
The words "non ex abundanti —
multa" appear to be directed against
one of the frequent remarks

TRACE which [illegible] that [illegible] have since drafted out,

Nice very often refers to a notion preceding, ready to use following.

It is an especial characteristic of the style of Cato (R. R.) to sum up a number of particulars with the words "haec" or "haec omnia"

(R. R. 5:37 : 73 : 133 : 51 : 31 : 33 : Plaut. Capt. 112, intro 4c)

(in Natt. 1, 369. ; Draeg. 1, 83)

Plaut. 5. 4. 2) Parare in animo &c. Vetuste additum est 'animo'. Exemplum in textu: "sed quid ego dico animo laetantur" (Bücheler 145)

It is difficult to discover [illegible] thing especially old-fashioned in the expression "parare in animo cupiditates". The quotation

from Ennius does not seem to be an exact parallel. In "animo lamentor" animo might be dispensed with but here the sense does not seem rounded without it.

However, the pleonastic use of animus, mens, cor &c in poetry is well known — and justifying from the examples, the use of animus with verbs of thinking is more or less [illegible]. For instance, cogitare cum animo Ter Adel. 582; Cic Leg. Agr. 2,64; Cato ap. Gell, 16,1,4; Fronto 221,7; "considerare in animo" Ter Haut 388; "cogitare in animo Ter, Adel, 30; 818; "animo meditari Nep. Ages. 4,1; Cam. 4,2; "animo cogitare - statuere apud animum Livy 34,2 (speech of Cato)

Pharm. 5.8. 71) Affectant viam.
Plautus [illegible]
Affectare viam or iter is mostly peculiar to Plautus and Terence.
Plaut Men. 686; [illegible];
Ter Haut 2.3.66; Pharm. 5.8. 71
Affectare iter; Cic. Rosc. Am. 48.
I find no examples of affecto, used in the sense of the foregoing
I can only explain the last part of the note by supposing that the Scholiast looked upon "affectare viam ad aliquid" as the original form from which all the various uses of affectare have been derived. In that case "quod non ἑλλειπτικῶς" would be entirely correct.

Β. Παρέμφασον, παρονομασία,
(On this subject see especially J. -

Wilkens, "Die neuen Bildungen der lat. Sprache", Sitz. Ber. d. bayr. Akad. (1881 ff. 1 ff.) and "Die Reime im Latein" [illegible] 1. [illegible] 13.
Schmalz, Lat. Gram. ff. 405, 2 ff.
Kahn, Progr. 1870 ff. 11 ff.

The fondness of the older writers for alliteration, punning and the like, is too well known to require any special treatment in this connection. What remains, is to examine the several comments on the subject, to see whether they agree with each other as well with Donatus, in this A. V. Grammar. (K. 4, 398) Donatus says: "Paronomasia est quae quandam denominatio, aut; "Nam inceptio est amplificatio non amplificatum" (Andr. 1, 3, 13). Evidently, he looks upon paronomasia as the approximate

of words which sound alike but have a different meaning — briefly, "punning" as we understand it.

Paronomeon, according to his definition is simply alliteration; "Cum ab eadem litte, in diversa verba sumitur, ut:—
"O Tite, tute Tati tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti," (Enn. Annales, 108)
Charisius (K. 1, 282, 7) holds the same view, Diomedes (K. 1, 448, 13) includes under paronomasia the "figura etymologica". "Paronomasia," he says, "est simili quadam denominatio cum praecedenti nomini aut verbo aut nomen adnexit ition ex eodem figuratio, ut, 'pugnam pugnit', 'facinora facit' &c. And then continuing:- "Et aliter fit &c" (repeating Charisius & Donatus)

Du Chart, the enlarges the sphere of parrhesia to an immense extent, likewise (446.30) he understands the use of parrhesia to "ne ba pel nominis pudicum impleva et timeas propediem familia superiorum, ut Pomponius Secundus, V.4.15)

In our commentary, great confusion is visible in the use of these two words — partly owing to a jumbling together of the definitions of Donatus and Diomed, and partly to a total misunderstanding of their meaning.

For instance:—

Rud.1.3.13) Nam inceptio est auctoritas "Ruabant vetres de proximo familia dicere; ut Cicero; "minus earum putavit pone de armario quam quod de lacunio fricet

ablatum." So far the note is all right, though it must be compressed, we should not be impressed in English by so far a fragment as the one quoted. After this follows the remarkable statement by some guileless commentator:- "Quaedam in verbis sunt quae παρόμοια dicuntur, in nominibus παρομοιότητι," Here, it will be observed, a distinction in drawn between παρόμοιον and παρομοία entirely foreign to anything the old grammarians have to say on the subject.

Cf. And. 1, 5, 7) "Id mutavit quoniam nil inmutatum," "παρόμοιον" — to which the second hand of And. 1, 1, 13 has again added: "Nam quaedam verba sunt παρόμοιον dicitur, quae

it was παροιμία παροιμιώδης." [illegible]
will be seen also, if παροίμιον applies to "mutare it — res immutatum" the definition of it given back to Diomedes rather than to Donatus,
Cf. Gud. 4, 4, 38) "Proverbium tigris in luto ibidem pervalvam"
"De proximo παροίμιον repetivit."
Again the note is added: "Et quando nomina sunt παροιμιώδη &c."
Compare Hec. prol. 2, 11: Hec. 1, 2, 90;
V. 1, 24: And. V. V. 8: Adel. 3, 3, 69) "Quod quo". "A coquendo dumpsit παροίμιον &c" (alluding to Cicero's form "tu quoque &c"). Evidently Donatus would have said: παροιμιώδη not παροίμιον. In Adel. 3, 2, 1,) "Omnem omnia" we read:— "ὑπερβολὴ cum παροιμιώδη 'omnem omnia', Certainly there is no paronomasia here.

Διαμένω πτερόεσσαν is rather to be expected. (Compare Adel. 2, 2, 2) "nihil apparent" "inane de praesenti repetitum est πτερόεσσαν, id est, 'comparant' et 'apparant'" — adding below, in contradiction to Adel. 2, 2, 1, "sic supra: "omnes omnia"

On "omnes omnia" (Adel, V. 9, 2) the commentator remarks with commendable caution: "Antiqua elegantia et figurata."

Heaut. 2, 3, 1, and 3, 5, 25 not only confuse the terms as defined by Donatus but also contradict each other (Haec. 2, 3, 1,) "Iniqua aequa" "Eaedem πτερόεσσαν" (Haec. 3, 5, 25) "Iniqua aequa" "πτερόεσσαν sunt Virgilianae."

The example noted by the commentator which tallies best with Do-

native theory of παρόρασον is Ennius
4.7.10) "Solus Sannio servat domi"
"Hinc pigua παρέλκεται di[illegible]"
Possibly also Acil. 3.3.10) "Vaptiae
ut putarunt puturae fiunt."
" — — Hae genus compositionis non
[illegible]"

So much for παρόρασον and παροιμία. That they are both characteristics of proverbial and especially older Latinity is without question. That Donatus so considered them is also evident. But the examples cited, show how haphazardly the parts of the [illegible] by later commentators.

b. Ellipsis.

The general question of ellipsis &c., although almost as much confused as that of παρέλκον and παρόρασον

lies more or less outside of the subject in hand. For convenience however, a few examples have been grouped under that title.

(See Hahn, Progr. (1872) p. 7 ff.)

Enn. 1, 2, v. 3) "Et fidibus scire," "Μετὰ τὴν ἐλλειψιν," (i.e. of cantare) Cantare with tibiis or fidibus as the ablative of instrument is to be found, though rarely, in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Virgil and Nepos, with ellipsis of cantare, I find only Cic. Lael. 8, 26: De Sen. 8: Tusc. 9, 22, 3.

(See Schmalz Lat Gram. p. 279, 99: Holtze 1, 135; Draeger 1, 547 ff.)

Enn. 4, 4, 10) "Nostra rumor"
Ἀφαίρεσις [illegible] ἡ ἀφαίρεσις τοῦ [illegible]

[illegible] nostrarum, id est, [illegible] domicilia nostra dimittit &c.

Compare Hec. 2.1.19 "nostrarum quisquis" (Later edd. "nostrarum") "nostrarum pro nostrum, sic veteres," Hec. 2.1.43 "Nostrarum nulla &c" "Pro nostrum" &c.

Hence, it seems to me, that either the note to Eun. 4.4.10 is by another hand or else that nostrum and nostrum have fallen out.

"Ἀριστοφάνης est figura, Pro nostrum nostrarum vel nostrarum &c."

The mechanism to which reference is is called them, is not the elliptical use of nostrarum but the well known use of the long forms nostrarum &c. for the classic nostrum.

(In Donatus, 1.350: Lorenz Plaut 2.50: Gell. 20.6.)

Adel. 2, 4, 6) Neid assentandi "Antiqua ἐλλειψις. Beset seine cuncta."

This seems to be the correct view and explanation of the passage. (See Eg. Adel. 270 and Koltze 1, 142 where a number of such exx. are given from early Latin.)

The point is to be said of the annexation in Adel. 4, 5, 14) "ut opinor haec non necesse" "Potuit recte dicere et hoc: "ut opinor haec [illegible] tuetur."

(see Eg. Adel. 64; Pharm. etc.)

Adel. 5, 1, 4) Minus [illegible], — — to 'minus necessitatis' for necessitate? Die seim bete me v discount; 'muto fuetum' et 'nolo

factum' cum alcuinus nec e- v- fecisset"

Compare the two notes on 'instat fuerim' Ad. 1.1.120

Esse is frequently omitted in early Latin - especially in formal expressions with velle, nolle, oportet, Adel. 165; 372; 695; 775; 919; Ph. 791 &c.

(See Dz. Adel. 13; Thorn. 165; Lattig 1.104)

Adel. V. 4.20) Illum ut vivat optant, Συλλήψις. Nam hic utrique loquebantur. Nos vero dicimus 'illi optant' non 'illum.'

Of course there is no proper syllepsis as Donatus understands it, here. The construction is that one so frequent in Comedy, where the

subject of the dependent clause is made the object of the leading verb. Cf. Exc. V, 1, 5; Plaut. Trin. 1, 2, 1; Exc. Aust. 2, 4

(Lat. Dialekte 2, 498)

Exc. 3, 2, 24 / Atque eis omnia adiuta "Lentio antiquo figurata. Then what seems a later addition: — "Et ita ἐπαλλάξ ; "ipsos omnia portantis eis omnia adiuta. Hyperbaton is not necessary to explain eis. A few cases of adiuto with the dative of the person are found in early Latin. Numerius (Brunt Hist. Journ. 16) also on a coin "Deus adiuta Romanis" (Eckh. D. N. 5 p. 223); Petr. Frag. (2 Buech.); "Deus mihi adiumento" Exc. 2, 29.

8. "Figura Etymologica".

This subject has been treated at large by Landgraf, "De figuris etymologicis linguae Latinae" Act. Soc. Erlang. 2. pp. 1–69. (Also cf. Schmalz p. 404; Lorenz Most 82 and Einleit Most. p. 31, &c)

As has been seen in the preceding pages, the commentator includes the fig. etymol. under the head of Pleonasm, pertaining the definition of Donatus.

Then [illegible] as referring more directly to it:-

Ecl. 3. v. 29) Lucretius under "Ut Vergilius (1. 12. 680). Figura [illegible]

4, 3, 2; Hdel V, 4, V" and Pth. prol 19,

E. ΠΡΟΟΙΚΕΛΕΥΤΟΝ,

(in Wolfflin "Other Nouns [illegible]

Archiv 1, 350–389: Schmalz ℔ 406 ff.: Wahln Progr. (1870) ℔, 13 ff.)

The statements of the commentators on this passage neither agree with each other nor with the definitions in the Art of Grammar. ??

For instance; Donatus 3, 2, 37 "Nihil fermentum, plentum", "Ἐποιοῦ-λεύτερον imitatum veteribus" in a case which Donatus would call hemeleptaton, "Semper similiter casus exeunt verbi declinatum ut hemeleptaton ab." "Hemeleptaton" he continues, "est cum similiter omnes dictiones pluralem finiuntur"

That the commentator recognized the more or less vulgar character of the figure may be seen by his notes to Eun. 2, 2, 5) "Pannicus, annigue obsitum", "Vel pannositas

verniliitate καὶ ἀ' ὁμοιοτέλευτον dictum &c. (Cf. note to Enn. 1, 2, 75)

Plautus, as is known, makes a very large use of the figure. Terence is more sparing (Cf. Donat. Phorm. 3, 3, 43 and Serv. Ecl. 3, 1 ; G. 3, 539 ; A 11, 112.)

No exx. occur in Ennius or the Twg. Frag., but are to be found in the orations, - sometimes in the letters. In short, after Plautus and Terence the usage does not appear to have extended in Latin literature until the archaists of the second century.

F. Irony.

Under this head two comments are to be noticed :-

Adel. 2, 1, 12) Ex tua victoria, "Sic vitreus fer sicuris ictus virtutis

for plagitia dicebant &c."

While strictly applying the commentator is correct, i.e. "the ancients used to say 'virtutes' &c." A careful observer of actual mechanism in thetoric,

It is well known how subtle and how frequent is the use of irony both in Latin and Greek,

Of the use of virtutes for plagitia or any other form of irony is less frequent in the later writers it is rather owing to the character of their subjects. That the figure should have ever died out among the people is of course out of the question. Its home in literature is oratory and the drama — in history &c, it was naturally much less used. Virtutes for plagitia

might have appeared old fashioned to the Commentator because the same more of it in the older authors.

The comment on Eun. 1, 2, 9) "Dare quia nero", Nam "nero" semper ironiae convenit ut Virgilius (A. 4, 93) is evidently a short interpretation of the scholia. Beneb. refers to the same passage (Rommel, op. cit.) "nero modo per ironiam dixit. Nam maiores nostri, ubi ponebant 'nero' semper ironiam significabant ut Virgilius (A. 4, 93)"
The expression 'maiores nostri' is used several times in the scholia but it is always used by Donatus. The connection between the notes however is evident, even to the quotation of the same passage of Virgil,

What nunc is often used ironically is well known (e.g. Cic. Verr. 2, 5. 47, 124: Phil. 12. 11. 25: Plaut. Trin. 5, 2, 43 &c) but the statement that the old writers always use nunc ironically is of course false.

3. Under the head of position I have reckoned two notes on the old use of enim and nam.

Adel. 2. 1. 14) "Enim inceptiva particula apud veteres fuit, sed ut convenit perturbationi."

This is confined to the comic writers: Plaut. Epid. 5, 2, 36: Merc. 2, 4, 14: Capt. 3, 4, 60: Per. Haut. 72: Phorm. 983 &c.

(See Lorenz Mil. 429: Brix Trin. 705)

Hec. 1, 2, 100) Nam hic inceptiva

particula est ut Plautus (Milco 1,1,6)
Compare Serv. Verg. G. 4, 445.
Cohen Servius, probably after Donatus, says:- "nunc hodie postponitur" he refers to a usage only poetic and perhaps not ante Augustum.
(De Lachmann Lucret. p. 246)

4 Construction acc. to sense,
Eun. 4, 3, 7) Absente nobis.
"Aut subdistinguendum est et subaudiendum me aut ἐσχισμένον figura est 'absente nobis' pro 'nobis absentibus' (Evidently a summary of conflicting views). Then follows a quotation from Pomponius 'praesente te nobis' and one from Varro, 'praesente legatis'. A second note (perhaps the view of Donatus himself) "Cum sic dicit pro praepositione

[illegible] 'absente' [illegible]
nam amicis.'

This use of praesente and absente is anticlassic and probably o-
-bjectionable in a [illegible] v.

The words were looked upon in
domiciliar [illegible] v.

Vincent Maresch 144 : Heinr. [illegible]
154, 191 Hyran, (Non. 76, 19) Ernest
(Non. 154, 20)

(See Koltze 2, 196 : 1, 352 : Draeger
1, [illegible] : Schmalz p. 294 B.)

Adel. 4, 4, 25) Afferite — aliquis.
"Non plerumque dicunt 'aliquis'
quamvis singulariter dicatur. Non
est enim 'aliquis' nisi de multis.
Recte ergo 'afer. aliq.' et non
ne". Then a second note :— "Non ve-
teribus non placet illud ubi dicen

distinctiones sunt inde 'aperite'
est una, altera, 'aliquis', aut an-
nectatur 'ecferimus'. Sunt prae-
ceteres et quis et aliquis et quis-
quam non observabant quo genere
aut quo numero declinarent. Est
ergo aliquis ἀόριστος.'

The question of gender will be considered later. The use of these pronouns with a feminine noun finds its roots in the conversational style and naturally goes to Plautus and Terence.

Vergil (A. 4, 613) uses aliquis once with sd singular "exoriare aliquis" (see Holtze 1, 299 ff. Brix Mell. 4, 674 Lorenz Pseud. 1272)

V. Attraction.

Eun. 4, 3, 11) Eunuchum quem dedisti

"...tut anticipatio est causae finis causa est: "Urbem quam statuo vestra est" (A. 1, V 73) and quem[adm] interrogationis praenuntiandum est sit qualem. (Evidently a summary of conflicting views, on which the commentator either could not or did not care to decide)

A note by another hand follows giving the correct explanation, that is, the first of the two proposed in the preceding, "Quidam recedunt" "the Augo," quem distinguere quasi dicat qualem sed necesse hae figura multum utitur vel deos esse. Enumerum unum ad dedisti verbum retulit &c," &c. the remarkable explanation of Servius (A. 1, 178) [illegible] perhaps from Donat. Phorm. V. 5, V 3,

Of course, we have here an example of the well known attraction of the antecedent into the relative clause, Ladewig (A. 1, S. 73) says it is rare [illegible] only in the poets,
Comp. however Cato, in leg. Macer. (A. frag. 2. - Serv. A. 1, S. 73) "Agrum quem vir habet, tollitur."
Plaut Curc. 3, 49 : 3, 63 : Merc. A, S. 28 & 30 : Hor. Sat 1, 10, 16,
(See Roby 1. 1077 ; Schm. 394, 1)

C. Old Formulae,
Pharm. 1, 2, 81) "Quod erit mihi bonum atque commodum."
Sic enim veteres : "Quod fanum [illegible] fuit dicunt aliquem aggredi,"
Compare with Cic. Div 1, 45, 102 :
"Quae maiores nostri quia malum

cenebant ideireo [illegible]
agendis: 'Quod bonum, faustum
felix fortunatumque sit' [illegible]
fabantur."

Cf. Plaut Trin 41; Ter. And, [illegible]; Cic. F. D. 1,45,118; Plaec. 41,103; Pu, Plaut, 1,63 &c.

Enn. 3,3,9) dolo malo.

"Quod autem addidit malo aut ἀρχαϊσμός est, quia sic in XII tabulis a veteribus scriptum est aut (2) ἐπίθετον doli perfidiosum aut (3) diastole est quia est et bonum quo a medentibus fuli aegrotantem decipi Lucretius poeta testatur (4,11) (Here it is again evident that we have a summary of several conflicting views) with the last explanation (3) com-

Sext Paul, ex Fest 69,10 (M.) "Dolo" vocabulum mire tantum in malis utimur, apud antiquos etiam in bonis rebus utebantur. Unde adhuc dicimus "Sim sine dolo malo". Nimirum quia volebant dici et bonos.

Dolus is quoted as originally having a good meaning — apparently on the authority of such passages as the one from Festus just given. I find no examples of it in that sense. That it was often used with malo is not a proof positive that it was originally used in a good meaning and therefore needed the adjective to define it. Such pleonastic expressions, it is needless to say, are common in the familiar language of all countries. In the elder tongue 'dolo malo' is frequent — In the conservative lang-

usage of the time it is a standing expression at all periods, for guile &c,

Plaut Rud. ~~5, 3, 25~~ 1391 ; Cic Off. 3, 14, 60 ; Tusc. 9 ; N. D. 3. 30 ; Sig. 4, 3, 1, ; 4, 4, 4 & often. Liv 1, 24 & 38, 11 (both in old legal documents), Compare however Plaut, Pseud. ~~4, 2, 4~~ 1247 ; Men, ~~2, 1, 3~~

Far more frequent and classic, tho' rare in Caesar owing partly perhaps to his legal training, is dolo alone, sometimes once used "dolum malum" himself (Gall. 4, 5, 1,) — "sine dolo" twice, both as explanations of "sedulo" (Adel. 2, 2, 43 ; Phorm. 2, 3, 81)

II. Of single words &c,

1, words obsolete or rare noticed by Donatus,

Nouns

Andria 3, 2, 10) In explaining 'puerpera' Donatus says: "non quod puerum sed quod filium peperit puerpera dicta est." The next note:- "Et apud veteres puer, puellus, puera, puella" implies that "filium" is used generally either as masculine or feminine. For puera compare Sust. Cal. 8; "quod antiqui puellas 'pueras' dicti tarent."

Liv. Andron (Prisc 697 P.): Naev. (Non. 156, 14 & 17)

Puellus: Lucil. (Non. 158, 18) Ennius (Non. 155, 10) [illegible] (Non. [illegible] 1 2 3 & 4) Plautus (Most 4, 249): Sacrat 4, 1252: Part of Stell 19, 11, 4: Appul, M. 7, 197, 10 &c.

Eun. 4, 3, 13) Donatus says the a[illegible]

cients called heavy wine "temetum"
" ie quod tentat mentem id est
debilitat"

As is often the case, the etymology
is by no means on a par with the
rest of the observation.

Compare Gell. 10, 23, 1, : " Vinum quod
'temetum' priscа lingua appellatur "

Plaut. Aul. 2, 6, 6, ; Cato (Pliny 14,
13, 14, 90) ; once in Cicero, Rep. 6,
4, 6, 6 ; Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 163 ; Juv. 15, 25,

Adel. 4, 2, 39) In commenting on
'angiportus' the scholiast, among
other opinions as to its derivation
says, - "Alii, quod in eo portus
sit locus angustus, hae est, in-
ter domos. Nam domos, vel
portus vel insulas antiqui dix-

[illegible]

Compare Festus p. 233 Müll, "Fortune in X II pro domo fortunam omnes pene consentiunt," Once with the meaning of "warehouse" Dig. 50. 16. 59. & Cassiod. Var. 1, 25.

Insula means a tenement as opposed to domus the abode of a rich family. Cic. Off. 3. 16. 66.; Tacit, A. 6. 45: 15. 43: Suet, Claud. 41: Tib. 48 Mart. 4. 37. 4 & which brings the word up to, at least the 2d century. In Eccles. Latin 'insula' is used for a temple.

P. 20 line 2.

Andria 3. 3. 48) Ecce um video, 'Ecce um' quasi ecce eum: Vetus v dixerunt ecce um, eccum?, eccum, quod apertius significat 'ecce illum' et abbreviatus illum.

Comparison with other commentators shows that the words "illum, quod apertius — illum" are a reference to the two conflicting views on the derivation of illum. "More plainly," he says, "illum stands for eccc illum, (en illum? cf. And. V. 2, 14), the theory that illum is a pronoun — another form of illum is more obscure," And. V. 2, 14) illum,

Conflicting views are again registered, "Alterum quod non illum dicimus vel ellum vel allum dicebant" (the pronominal theory) — "quamvis quidam [illegible] aliter intelligi — dicens 'illum' quasi 'en illum' (this is the theory of Donatus himself if we may trust Aro, Ter. Ph. 280, 31 & Serv. Ae. V. 548, 6,). Further the commentator adds:— "Est enim ut alii

volunt, pronomen, et alii, ad-
uersum demonstrantiu, reflecting
the first view; Num pronomina
huiusmodi uitiosa sic frequentant
'ille, illius, illus. Sed ut diximus
[illegible] reflect-
ing Donatus' view as the correct
one. Donatus is again repeated
in Aud. 3, 3, 48. In Adel 2, 3, 7. the
two views are again registered with
an indication that the pronomi-
nal theory is preferred.

Donatus then seems to have looked
upon eccum as a contraction of
ecce eum, illum for in illum &c
and this agrees with modern ideas
on the subject.

(See Skeng. Aud, 580 (2d ed.) 1; 85 J;
Dz. Adel. 361; Forcell. Miller 1310;
Brix, Capt. 100 J; Neil. 789; Koltze 1, 280 f.)

And. V, 4, 29) Ediam igitur,
"Mittite etiam quod cui libet
generibus et cuiibus debuit."
Compare schol. to Hunt Prol. 8 –
(Kennedy 2, 363) and Serv. Ecl. 3, 1,
Etiam, a, um is common in Plautus
and Terence. It disappears in
the later writers but that it was
retained in the popular speech is
shown by its survival in the Span-
ish cuyo, cuya,
(See Meyer 1, 355 ; Brix Most. 41
and esp. Spengel And. 763)

Verso,

And. 3, 2, 12) Continuo
"— — —. Nam tumo istuc
dicebant olim praepositione."
Temno is poetic and very rare for
the classic contemno. Lucret 3, 957;
Verg. A. 6, 620 ; 7, 236 ; Ovid A. A. 3, 299;

Hor. Sat. 1, 1, 116; 2, 2, 38; Tac. H. 3, 47,)
the use of the simple verb for the
more usual compound is an element
in the art of the Latin poet (Schmalz
382, 36)

Hec. 3, 4, 10) Infugerim
Sic veteres quod nav, fugerim.
Infugio is very rare but classic, what
is called by Gellius, Pliny, Suetonius
Vergil, Horace, Ovid or Sallust, Twice
in Cicero's orations, Verr. 1, 35; 5, 79;
and once in Tacitus H. 2, 8.
Praef. 1, 9, 30; Livy 1, 25, 8.

Adverbs,

And. 2, 1, 35) Ne mihi detur.
Veteres frequenter ne pro non di-
cebant, Compare And. 4, 4, 45; Eun
2, 3, 36, quoting 'ne vult' for 'non
vult' (Menaech. 1, 2, 1?), In E

1, 3, 2, he explains 'neminem' as 'non est nemo' and adds; 'ne pro non' &c, compare Pun 2, 1, 49 and Pharm. 1, 2, 7 where he calls 'neminem ne' "vitiosa locutio" (quoting from Ennius) and adds; "Et ne pro non accipiendum."

As is well known ne was the primitive negative particle — non a derivative, In the times of Plautus the usage was unsettled, ne and non being used indifferently for simple negation as is shown by ne vis and ne vult besides non vis and non vult, nescio and non scio. The separated non velim &c (Madv 481) are common along with the compounds of the verb, only the compounds are used. (See Draeg. 1, 133; Holtze 2, 321; Bri

Trin. 1156 : Lor. Nov. 1110)
Thus nec the stronger form of nec.
one Lor. Nov. 246.
The 'ultimum nec of Pharm. 1. 3, V 20
has an I can discover "a "native e
cutic." Ultimum nec from anc e-
qually in use, & ic. Att 11. 9, 3 uses
both forms.

In some of the preceding comments
on nec for non, Donatus approves of
minimum and quidni, also speaks
of the use of ni for nec, (Eun. 3.
3. 2 : 2. 3. 6 : Ep. 4. 4. 7 and Serv. A.
3. 686
Ni as an absolute negation remains
only in the two words which Do-
natus mentions.
In inferentive and intentional clauses
ni for nec in antelaxic and

particle. (See Holtze 2, 277.)

Pharm. 1, 1, 9,) Inciatim
"Sic vetera multa," referring probably to the adverbs in -tim sparingly used by the classic writers but used in great numbers by [illegible]
(See Draeg. 1, 117 par. 65)

Eun. 4, 3, 15) "Sui vir sies"
"In utrisque inventus" what "is found in the old writers?" The words must represent a much longer comment. At least three things occur in the passage quoted ~~that Donatus might have used~~: "in utrisque inventus," In the first place, the paraphrase of te ("te ostendis qui vir sies,") which

as was shown inside the head of "attraction" Donatus looks upon as an archaism. In the second place, he may have taken qui as the old-fashioned representative of ut (Cf. [illegible] Ad. 1, 1, 21; Haec. 1, 1, 6; [illegible] 54; 4, 1, 38; And. 2, 1, 17; 2, 1, 34; Eun. 5, 3, 2.; Phorm. 1, 2, 80; 2, 3, 34; 2, 3, 49; Hec. 5, 3, 14.), or in the third place, as is more likely, [illegible] refer to the archaic use of qui for quis.

(See Koltze 1, 392.; Weix, Trin. 439)

2. Incorde, the meaning of which has changed to

[illegible]

Andria 1, 5, 16) Donatus remarks, "Etiam frame verbum [illegible] 'operationem' dicebant."

This note seems to have been in-

quoted by the passage quoted.
Compare however Cicero, (N. 1, 152,
10.) ; Plaut, Epid, [illegible] ; Cic. V. S.
5, 11, 47, [illegible] a "verbum"
[illegible]

Adel. 2, 5, 15) "Verum illud verbum est"
"Illud est, quod [illegible]
Et hoc [illegible]
tentia, Compare notes on Eun.
1, 2, 95 ; 1, 2, 98, ; 4, 5, 6 ; Adel, 5, 8, 29,
so [illegible] the use of verbum
for proverbium or sententia belongs
chiefly to the antehadrian period,
Plaut, Pseud. 4, 1, 32 ; 4, 3, 89 ; Ter,
Adel, 5, 3, 17. ; Plaut, Trin. 2, 6, 11 ; Cas,
2, 5, 39 Aspice, Gell. Praef. 11. 7.
(In Spengel Cicero 240 [illegible]
Donatus uses 'verbum' once
in the same manner)

Andria 2, 6, 2) Gratia.
"Gratia, pro causa interim ponebant." (Compare notes on Adel. 4, 2, 45 and Andria 3, 4, 8) "Gratia pro causa ponit nunc."

Gratia with a pronoun, as above, is mostly anteclassic and hence, as might be expected, it is largely affected by the archaists of the Second century,

Plaut. Baech. 497; Pseud. 1277; Ter. Haut. 3, 4, 26; Hec. 617; Eun. 1, 2, 99; 1, 2, 159; Gell. Ing. 54, 4; 80, 4.
(See Koltz 2, 53; 1, 143)

Adel. Prol. 1, 1) Scripturum dicam. "Indifferenter omnis qui aliquid scripsit scriptor a veteribus dicebatur." Does he mean that "scriptor" was used for comedy

ficiens, historicus &c," or that
scriptor was applied to anyone who
wielded the pen for a living? In
either case the remark is not sup-
ported by trustworthy examples. /

Adel. 2, 1, 39) C hominem infirmum,
"die vetere infirmum generaliter
pro imbecillo sumebant ut in
eadem hac fabula (3, 3, 6)
Compare Lehal, Rembin to Adel. 2,
1, 29. (Hermes 2, 383.)
Plaut Rud. 3, 2, 38: Ter. Eun. 2, 2,
4; Haut. 4, 1, 16; Cic Cat. 2, 10, 23;
Rosc. Com. 7, 20; Sest. 16, 59; Repub.
1, 5; Att. 9, 15.
(Cic Orat. Adel. 183)

Adel. 4, 5, 16) Virgo,
"Virginem autem ἀρχαϊστῶς pro mul-

icne dixit," (compare note to Adel. 4.7.13 where the quotes Verg. E. 6.47, judging from what xx can be gathered this horse use of virgo is largely poetical, Ovid Fa. 6. 403; Verg. E. 6.52; Hor. C. 2.8.23; 3.14.9; Curt. 5.1.38; Just 1.3.2, Cf. Virg. E 3.39.

(Attention might be called, in favoring to a similar use of "maid" in old English, "pucelle" in French &c.)

Adel. 5.8.20) Age prolixe,

"but "age prolixe", id est, "age benigne," ut sit prolixe benigne secundum naturem &c."

The alternative proposed is that "prolixe" is a noun in the vocative, according to his function

this is the view adopted by Klotz, later editors (e.g. Oz.) preferably take "prolixe" as an adverb,

In the sense of "contrary" of words in Ciceronian: Planc. 3.8, 8; Att. 16.16.4; 6.3.5; of the adverb in this sense I find no ex.

Phaedr. 1.1.5 / [illegible]

"Columen culmen, an columen columna? Unde columnae apud Petronium dicti servi maiores domus, (quoting Lucilius (Bachr. 412) and Tubero.). Nonius cites, s.v. columinis columinum (C. 1.35.13, the only ex.), Ennius (Bachr. 232).

Then follows a note by another hand, drawn apparently from the preceding.

Columen is often used in the

But the foregoing are the only examples I have found of calcimella and calcima used in this trafical sense,

Pharm. 2, 8, 83) Amicos advocabo, "Amicos et fre testimonio et fro advocatio utimur frequenter". A similar use in Greek is well known. This note however, seems rather to have been drawn from the passage. Compare Cic. Acc. 8, 22. ; Hor. C. 2, 18, 12. ; Juv. 3. 57 &c.

Adjectives.

Abel. 4, 5, 39.) Jam grandem, "Grandem ad actatem veterem pertulerunt non ad corpus. Et in parte actatis dicitur grandis non in tota vita nisi si adhuc matu

ut: "grandis natu parens adducetur ad supplicium." Et 'grandis impune et grandis puer et grandis ephebus et grandis virgo' [illegible] Phorm. 2.3.15 which seems to be a short summary of the preceding. To say that the ancients used grandis only of age & not of size is, of course, going too far. Grandis alone (in speaking of a growing person) is evidently used both of age and size — the size as a result of the age.

Lucret. 2.1164; Cic Div. 36.87; Senec. 4.10; Hor. Ep. 13.11; Juv. 7.210.

Grandis natu or aevo (acta v. Vv. M. 6.28 &c.), as may be seen, is used in a somewhat different sense. Plaut. & Cic. Hor., Ovid, Sueton. Tacitus &c.

Enn. 1, 2, 52) Facie honestā,
Schol. Bembin 1st hand. (Hamm. 2, 356)
"Honestum dicit pulcrum, Nam
nam [illegible] honestum' [illegible]
relevant [illegible]. Nam facie
post dictum est — — 'inhonestum'
(Fam. 2, 3, 65) id est deformem,
(Compare Schol. 3d hand (Hamm id.)
Enn. 2, 1, 24 & 3, 2, 21 also Donatus
Enn 2, 3, 65) "Inhonestum, praeclare
ut contra; "facie honestā (Enn 1,
2, 52) ut apud Vergil, (A, 1, 595),
[illegible] to Enn. 2, 1, 24;
3, 3, 21; And. 1, 1, 96,) The Schol. to
Enn. 1, 2, 52 is especially important
as it is probably much nearer the
original note of Donatus than the
short notices of Enn. 2, 3, 65; 2, 1, 24
and 3, 2, 21,
Honestus of personal appearance

in metrical practice. Ter Haec. 4, 4, 15; And. 1, 1, 96; Heaut. 2, 3, 92; 3, 1, 1; Ad. 5, 10, 1; Phorm. 1, 4, 2; 2, 1, 2; Haut. Tim. 68.

Verbs.

Allegra prol. 3) Adiutans, die retrieve divine maiestatem [illegible] adiuvans." Kauer, Debut, to have passage (Hermes 40) which is almost identical,

In Adel prol 16 the text now stands 'adiutare' (cf. Donat), In Pharm. 3, 3, 4, on the contrary 'adiuvit' (cf. Donat,)

Adiuvo also occurs:- Pharm. 5, 3, 2; And. 2, 2, 16; 3, 2, 43; Heaut 1, 2, 29, Adiutrix (the [illegible] form); And. 1, 3, 4; Heaut 3, 1, 7; 3, 2, 25; Pharm. 1, 2, 49; Hec. 3, 2, 24; Plaut Pseud. 1, 1, 83 (for adiuvo)

Cav. 3. 3. 17; Trin. 3 [illegible]; 2, 7, 8; Att. (Nov 424, 2); Lucret 1, 112. &c.

Pharm. fral. 2) Transdere, "'Transdere' vetteres dixerunt, quod nos dicimus tradere et tralatum nos translatum. C contrario." The evident relation of the sense to the name passage (Hermes, 2, 377) may be seen, (For these forms see Neue 2, 734 ff.) Transdo is most frequent in Cav-ar; B. G. 1, 68; 1, 76; 3, 57; B. Cv, 7, 25; 7, 77; (X) 8, 43 &c.; Dir. Pharm. fral. 2; Attius (R. 366; 630) Tradere Pharm. 3, 1, 7 often in Plaut-us & later writers.

Cum. fral. 411,) Animadvertite, "Nos ἐλλειπτικῶς dicimus "ad-

meritis quod notare velim "animum adverte." It is evident that the animadverte at the head of this comment should be changed to "animum adverte". The context shows that Donatus so read it. The text however is Terence's favorite "animum advortite" (cf. Donat. And. prol. 5 where he reads "attendite", Spengel, following Fleckeisen and the older editors "advertite" (see Spengl. And. prol. 5, Umpfenbach.)

The MSS. vary so much between animadverto and animum adverto that it is very difficult to get trustworthy statistics. The full forms is very frequent in the antetlassic period, so much so that all the Terentian exx.

animadvertō [illegible]
to animum advertō by the la-
ter editors.

Animadvertō was used generally
in the classical period — in the
forms, confined mostly to Virgil,
(4, 2, 259 sc), Animum advertō,
if we may trust the MSS, occurs
more or less frequently throughout
the literature. The construction
with the accusative and infinitive
is for the most part ante clas-
sic, appearing in Cicero, Caesar
and Sallust as an archaism.
Advertō [illegible] occurs
once perhaps in Cicero (Pro Mur. 1, 1,)
Verg, 4, 4, 11, [illegible]
the historians, especially, Tacitus
and Pliny, Advertere in aliquem
occurs only in Tacitus (A. 1, 22 fin)

Statistics for Adel. Phorm. & Hecyra show that homoeoteleuton is of three forms as follows:- Animadverto 13 times, adverto 4 times (one Eunuchus 81, 2, 4C6, 2 S) and animum intendo once. (Ph. 1, 4C, 22.)

And C. V. 11) "minor" made it.

"Minor" utters came under pre "necesse" forebent. Then what [illegible] to "mean explanation by a [illegible] consecutive hand:- "Nam admiratio ab ignorantia descendit." (Plaut. Aul. prol. 1) Compare note to Eun. 2, 2, V 9,

If there is any archaism in the use of this expression I have been unable to discover it. What examples are to be found however, and with Caesar, minor sunda; Cic N. D. 1, 34, 95; "Duo" Plaut Stich

541: "Quid" Cic Lent. 1, : Per Eun. 2, 2, 59; "Quamvis" Cic. Verr. 2, 2, 54, 134; "Quae cunque" Cic. Verr. 2, 2, 63,

Andria 2, 1, 35) Dat habeo, Die antigui pro sufficit "satis habeo" [illegible] — [illegible] dat? (παράλλον again!) This expression seems to have been frequent in the "Sermo vulgaris", Plaut Most. 654; Amph. prol. 79; 509; Most. 389; 654; 831; Aul. 777; Bacch. 1119; And 4, 2, 37; Eun. 3, 2, 32 &c,
(Su Koltze 2, 7 + 1, 164; Brix Capt 446; Skeny And. 335; Schmalz 210,)

And. 2, 2, 24) Acciderit alquid boni, Notin accidesit [illegible]

et ab hac et apud veteres frequentatum," Isidor. Diff. 1, 3 says: - "Contingunt bona, accidunt mala, eveniunt utraque."

This distinction is generally observed. Accident bona leave sacr. Cic Fam. 2. 1. 1 11, 15; Caes. B. G. 4, 22; 7, 3; Nepos Milt. 1, 1, 2; Adel. 1, 2, 7) designavit.

- - - Hoc verbum apud veteres duas res significabat; etenim [illegible] designare.

Designare in a bad sense is very rare: Plaut most 2, 1, 66 & the ne, with the meaning of 'effect' &c. Hor. Ep. 1, 5, 16.

(In however Ziatzko Adel 87 who thinks we ought to read designare

in the three ex. quoted. The Mss
[illegible] .)

Andria 2, 2, 28) Renuntio
Re agitata apud veteres in-
terdum abundat ut modo 'Re
nuntio pro nuntio, ut Cicero;
"renuntiatur mihi." (compare
note to And. v. 1, 8.) Remittere: "pro
mittere" (remitto for mitto is rare,
Not in Cicero or Nepos; Suet. Aug.
52, 5, Hor. C. 3, 11, 2.) (compare
note to And. 1, 2, 41) Reverti: "Re
abundat" (Revertio in the common
word. Revertio is rare — not in Cic-
ero, Cat. 11, 2, 28: Livy 45, 28 &c.)

Renuntio in the sense of nun-
tio is rare and for the most
part, a ticlusic. Ter. Heaut.
[illegible]

Lucr 4,4,5; Ter. Ad. 2,2,11; [illegible]
Plaut Pseud. 1,5,6; [illegible]; Bacch,
1,2,49; Men 2,3,67; Cic Cluent,
5,17 &c,

The use of compounds for simple
verbs, more or less noticeable in
every language was a peculiarity
of the "sermo quotidianus"
The practice was discontinued by
the writers of the golden age
but with the decline of literature
the usage again crept out,
(De Schmalz 383, par. 39)

Fidel. 1,1,2,) Edixi e parvulo,
Suet. new [illegible]
decerne veteres decernunt, ut; (Berg
4,6,7&5), Varro's distinction
(Non. 447, 32) " Edicit obstetrix,
edicunt nutrix &c. in not always

strictly observed, (Lg. [illegible])
e.g. Plaut Cure. 4, 2, 3-2 ; [illegible],
1-3, 2.9 ; Rud. 1-3, 3-5 ; Per. Rud.
5, 2, 5 ; Aul. 2, 1, 1 ; Cic. de Orat. 2,
2, 14 ; Liv. 1, 9 ; 21, 40 ; Plaut
1, 1, 4 & 41 ; Merc. 1, 2, 413 ; Col. 3,
10, 16 ; Curt 3, 12, 6 &c.

Pharm. 5, 1, 16) "Lucem te esse dictitasti."
Esse pro nominare antiquorum more dixit."
This note seems to rest upon the passage quoted, as the commentator understood it.
"Lucem" shows that esse is the word to be used.

Adel. 4, 2, 36) Neque accidet,
"accidit pro vibrementer acci[illegible]

Nunc accidere ut praecedere
ne (some edd., "praecidere") ad
eadem reperebantur apud ve-
teres,

Nec video ut hoc
meaning is very rare, Varro
R. R. 1, 31, 1; Vulg. Exod. 13, 3,
The confusion in the text I think
that the reading praecedere is
questionable. I find no example
either of praecedere or perce-
dere, although, as a general thing,
conjectural readings, especially by
typos, are a delusion and a snare,
still I would suggest "praecidere"
here, as an emendation. Plaut.
Cas. 2, 6, 52. cf. Persa 2, 4, 12 (Ritschel)
The memory of the preceding "ac-
cidere" is enough to account for
praecedere it seems to me

Pharm. 1. 2. 91, Nunc amitte,
"Hoc quod nos dicimus 'dimitte',
antiqui etiam dicebant 'amitte'", Virgilius (1. 2. 148); et Sallustius: "factionem amittere" &c.

Amitto, to "send away" &c. is antecl assic, frequently in Plautus and Terence, Trs. Mount. 3. 1. 71; 4. 8. 17; And. V. 3. 27; (Dz. reads "mitto"); Plaut. Miles 4. 8. 66; Capt. 2. 2. 82; Most 2. 2. 2. &c.; Varro (Non. 83, 12) retinuit (Non. 72. 32)

Dimitto in this sense, it is needless to say, is classic,

Adverbs &c.

And. 4. 3. 5) Facile hic fluvius malis,
"Facile adverbium confirmantis est id quod est liquido et manifesto. Veteres dicebant facile pro certo, ut Cicero:- "Illum

civitati v facile princeps."

Facile in this meaning is frequent in Cicero, but elsewhere rare.

Plaut. Epid. 3.4.68; Trin. 3, 2.80; Cic T.D. 1.3.81; Rosc. Am. 6, 15; Cluent. 5. 11; Div. 2. 42. 87; Fam. 6. 10. 1.; Quint. 10. 1. 68 &c.

Eun. 5. 8. 34) Nihil est quid dicas, Nihil pro non, ut sit: non est quod dicas mihi; id est, nihil est quod dicas, pro non dicas mihi, ut sit quod pro non, quod pro quid dicas mihi, [illegible] id est autem utinam dic locutus esse! (Cf. notes to Eun. 5. 2. 45; 2. 2. 42; Adel. 2. 1. 3; Eun. 4. 5. 9; Phorm. 1. 2. 90.), ("Nullus pro non" notes to Eun. 2. 1. 10; Heaut. 1. 2. 4.)

("Nunquam fro non" :- Enn. v. 8, 62 ; Adel. 3, 1, 16 ; 4, 1, 12 ; Ph. 1, 2, 71.)

Nihil, nullus and nunquam for non are conversational and belong especially to the comic dramatists, Plaut. Cuv. 2, 4, 26 ; Most. 2, 1, 41 ; Mure. 12 ~~1662~~ ; 1, 2, ~~1164~~ 217 ; Enn. v. 8, 62 ; Plaut. Asin. ~~3, 3, 46~~ 651 ; Merc. v. 2, 670 ; E. 3. 47 ; Cf. Plaut. Amph. ~~1, 1,~~ 270 ; Mil. ~~4, 1, 16~~ 1142 ; Capt. ~~1, 1, 8~~ 2 ; 909 ; Ter. Adel 4, 1, 12 &c,

(See Nottz 2, 202 ; 1, 409 B. ; 410 D, Brix Capt. 989 ; 408 ; Men. 1012,)

Pharm. 2, 3, 24) Alliarmeiter

"Apud veteres 'illiarmeiter' dicebant pactum, in quo duae vel plures simul gerunt malefici. Sic in Adel. (4, v. 30) Agnatus &c, ; Ter. Adel. 4. v. 30.

& ic, Repub. 1, 22, 1 Att, 16, 3, 2 ;
4, 3, 5.

Eun, Anal. 9, 1 Nunc super dicit,
"Super ad ablat. multis [illegible]
vitiose propter ambiguitatem cum
adpetiane proferebant, Nam nisi
addaret (nunc' hoc 'super' olim,
fridem etiam significavit."
This use belongs to the S. Vulg, and
is ante- & post-classic.
Plaut, True, 2, 4, 45 ; Hymn. Ef.
2, 3 ; Apul. M. 9, 16, 224, &c.

And, 3, 2, 1, 1 Adhuc & hactenus quae &c,
"Sic vitiose scribebant adhuc,
[illegible]
ex praesentibus rebus firma
inti mabant quod est [illegible]
simae promissionis et cautae."

(Sir Heard, 1, 156 fol.)

Heb. 1, 2, 7) Salue mi eus tor.
"Cum salutantis addebunt
inuisurandum ut hoc deduc fa-
cere videantur."
"Lucius Tubero" Plaut Trin [illegible]
This note seems to rest upon the
passage quoted. I find nothing
to support it.

3. Changes in form &c.

Nouns.

Adel. 5. 3. 55) "Cum primo luce" (sic)
Ἀρχίππος, Nam cum primo lu-
ce" [illegible] luce probably parentis &c. (Then a
second time evidently an improvement from
the first! — "Vetimus mane uenire
quem dicamus lucem".
The genuine form is, of course, lucē

The note shows that the commentator did not understand the form. The Schol. Bern. (Hermes, 2, 400) preserves the genuine reading, but explains it as a genetive.

(With the first note compare the one at Ven. A. (B) 1, 402, 2,)

Luci is, of course, an old and peculiar form of the locative in the temporal sense. The old grammarians have none, as may be seen from the foregoing. Indeed all such expressions as "primo luci" &c. to an original masculine nominative lucus.

(See Ziatzko Odd. 841; Usener, Fahrb. f. Philol. (1878) p. 76 ff.)

And. 2, 2, 28) Nihil ornati. "Πολλαχοῦ, die Sabinerin: " [illegible]

Ornati decreto Servilium, ne
dit." Compare note to Eun. 2, 2, 6,
"Et ornati ut Ornati antiquae
[illegible]." Compare the note of
Fuller schol. Bemb. to this form e
[illegible] (Schmid) (Kennedy 3, 348)

Its connection with Donatus to
And. 2, 2, 28, is shown by the fact
that 'nihil ornati' &c, is quoted,
also the same passage from Sal-
lust, "Ornati decreto &c."

Also compare Donatus on 'domi
forique' (Eun. 4, 7, 47); Hec. 3, 2, 2,
'tumulti' quoting Sallust again!
Phorm. 1, 3, 2 'audienti' referring
to And. 2, 2, 28, — also schol. ex
[illegible] Schol. V. 4, 16, (Kennedy 2, 400)

The system of cross reference
and quotations especially noticeable
[illegible]

old gnathic (4th decl.) in i, seems to be an indication of the manner in which the commentary of Donatus had grown to its present proportions.

At some point, perhaps Andria 2,2,28, Donatus may have stopped [illegible] in full, giving appropriate quotations, and references to various apposite passages in Horace. Succeeding commentators record a brief statement of his note at the passages indicated, adding his quotations & illustrations.

[illegible] Prabus (K. 4, 213, 14); Serg. in Donat (K. 4, 515, 30) and Charisius (K. 1, 212, 18). For the use of this

genetive in Terence are Engelbrecht 'Studia Terentiana', who follows Ritschl in claiming the i forms to be the only ones in Plautus and Terence

Plautus certainly never uses this genetive in -ius.

(For Cicero, see Nisi 1, p. 353 and for the subject in general see:- Ritschl, Op. II, 697, Lach. 870; Spengel, Andr. 365 (2d. ed.) Brix, Trin, 250)

And. 3, 5, 2,) Nulli consilii,

"Terence favors contraction [illegible] 'nulli consilii'; nec nullius et solius; necte autem vetustus 'nullo, nulli, solo, soli' declinabunt."

Compare Cherubino (Dt. 1, 111, 7; 159, 10) and Donat Eun. 5, 6, 3) "nihil solae"

"ad. [illegible]

nom. plot. old antique, ut alibi;
referring to Capt. 2, 3, 30, where
it is important to note the scholi-
on given us by Schopen (Hermes v
2, 368): "virtus altera" ut saepe
totus."

(For Terence use of these old
forms, see: Engelbrecht, Stud.
Terent.: for Plautus, Ritschl 2,
692: Brix & Lorenz' index 3 & 6,)
Nisse 2, 183 pp. and for special
treatment of all these forms! —
Luchs in Studemunds Studien)

Dative forms like mihi, alio
huic, suae, totae & illae are to
be found occasionally in the best
writers. The usage seems to have
come from the familiar speech.
Terence never uses the feminine in
ius or i. In the masculine he

[illegible]

Pharm. 4, 2, 5) Paulus, Hoc volup nonnemo est, ut hoc fuerit, Sic enim scripsere fere alii loquendi auctores."

Compare Bronca (N. 1, 452, 26) and Paul. ex Fest. (87 Müll.)

Terence uses volup only in the single phrase volup est (Pharm. 610 Haec. 857) but in Plautus volup occurs thrice with other words, twelve times with est. Traces of the original adjective volupis remain. Tracul does not occur either in Terence or Plautus, Lucil. (Non 111, 19); Pacuv. (Non. 111, 21); Horat. (Non. 111, 22); Attius (Non 111, 24)

(Der Engelbrecht Stud. Pl. [illegible] Wien Akad. 577)

Adjectives,

Adel. 4, 3, 7) Hilarum
"virtute, non hilarem,
Compare Probus (IV, 4, 495, 7,) "hi-
lus in legi et hilarus in Terentio."
Lin Exam, 314 "gracilis" in
need for the "graciles" of Donatus,
Hilaris was abundant all through
Patristic
(see Engelbr. St. Par. [illegible] 1, 3 7,)

Phorm. 4, 3, 6) Compluria,
"Plautinum regulum loquitur est,
Nam hoc compluris et haec compluria,
(Then a second note), "Non
'haec compluria', sic veteres quod
nostri dempta syllaba complura
dicunt, sic Cato de viz II do (quoting)
Cicero in Protagora (quoting), Lucilio
quia [illegible] duo plura [illegible]

plus dicebant."
Gellius (V. 21, 6) devotes a chapter
to the form "pluria", citing Ca-
to, Fal. Antias, Ælius, Nigidius and
Varro for the form "pluria".
Plautus and Terence use only plura;
Plautus [illegible] etc. throu-
out the language. (Compare also
Charisius (K. 1. 73, 15 ; 125. 3)
Hoc plura is of course a fiction of
the grammarians to account for
pluria. The oldest record for
of the [illegible] is "plurus" (Ennius
in the S. C. de Bacch.)
(Cf. complurim, the one ex. in Terence,
[illegible] Engl. p. 31 : [illegible] ;
Dz. Phorm. Euclit 33, 2.)

[illegible],
And. 4, 1, 32) Hoc nuptiae
" Legitur et "Haec nuptiae", (So Th.

editors read) Sic enim interrex dixerunt. (compare note to Eun. 3. 5. 34 and Eun. 2. 2. 38) Kiessl.

"Pro hi, istuc. So far the note is correct. The reference to Vergil, "his certe &c" (E. 3. 102) is evidently the addition of a later hand. (See Hagen Jahrb. Buch. 14 (1868) 472) Compare also note to Phorm. 2. 1. 60.

Schmidt (Hermes 8. 478) shows that Terence uses hace before vowels and -le, -lic, -lis, -lus, (Cf. however Dz. Eind. Phorm. p. 40) Plautus never uses anything but hace, The forms occurs [illegible] in Vergil, Cicero, Livy &c.

(In addition to the foregoing [illegible] see Madvig Adv. II. 113 (1871); Engelbr. p. 13; Lipsius, Gr. Lat. [illegible]; Neue 2. 103; Fleckeisen; [illegible]

877 and Forenz Marx. 923)

Verr. V.

And. 1.2.17) Divi,

"Divi antique — [illegible] Add.

(1.2.24), Compare Diomed (K. 1.

374.13) who says dii is the better

form, divi, old fashioned. For Add

read dixit. Plautus only uses "di

ni and the contracted dirim, diru

&c. — divti for divisti (Miles 1072)

Dissent, Lic Dest 19.44; Fiory 27.6;

3.18, 4.20 generally.

Arnold perfect divi, divisse is

quoted by Diomed but the pre

ceding note has no reference to such

a form as divi. Evidently the

distinction drawn is between dii

or divi.

(See Engelbrecht & Skeng. And. 1.2.17)

Hec. 4, 1, 57) Quita est,
"Ab activo quo fassivum fecit
quae retinendo participium sed
antiqua dixit, (Compare Diomed
K. 1, 385, 17)
(Do Nunc 2, 607; Koltze 2, 30)
And. 4, 1, 37) Comparate alterco et
"Legitur et 'altercatus es', Non
enim alterco dicimus"
Terence uses altercor only in this pas-
sage (Dfeng, 653) cf. Pacuv. (R. 210)
And. 1, 1, 12) Nam civitum est,
Lic et placitum et probatum id
esse quae nos placuit, fuerit,"
Compare Donat (R. 1, 371, 7)
This comment needs no further
enlargement.
In the use of active verbs after-
wards deponent Engelbr. (p. 30)
shows that Terence varies but

slightly from the practice of the Golden Age. The case is quite different in Plautus (See Brix, Trinum. 172). Remarks on these forms are frequent in the old grammarians, (e.g. Donat. K. 4, 400; Serv. A. 1, 4: 1, 164: 1, 194: 1, 317 (Prisc. 1, 402): A. 4, 403: 7, 273: 11, 660: G. 1, 184 cf. A. 12, 263: G. 1, 193: 3, 314 (Prisc. 18, 193)

Adel. 1, 1, 3 [illegible] ierunt

"Producta i pronuntiando quod nos addita u 'uerunt' dicimus, Tale est illud Vergilii: (A. 2, 25) "Non abiisse rati &c"

'Tale est &c" is evidently the addition of a later hand. The note "producta &c, refers to such old fashioned transitional forms as ierunt, for i &c standing between the full ierunt

and fruī and the regular classic
ĭerunt and fiī. The writer of
"Tale 42" shows by his punctuation
that he understood the words pre-
ceding to refer only to the regular
classic ĭerunt for iuerunt
(in such transition forms see § 3,
Adel. 27. They occur generally at
the end of the verse or before inter-
punction (cf. Conradt Hermes 10
1875) as may be proved generally of most
of the old or vulgar forms used
by Terence. The transition from
the uncontracted to the regular
contracted forms is shown by the
variation (, timuĕrunt,
timuērunt Pharm. 73; audīerunt
Adel. 813; but iit, Eun. 892, Pharm.
706; but iit Adel. 104
(but also exiatyKo Pharm. 311).

Abel, 3, 4, 3b) Abdnec.

"Nt (4, 11, 463), Nam postea [illegible] ezt," compare the much fuller Nchal, to draw passage, (Hermes 2, 390) and Nchal, on "trudnec" Abel J. 7, 12 (p. 402)

compare Ethiop. (N. 1, 256, 18 and 349, 25)

Besides dic, duc, fac and fer Terence uses face, but only at the end of the line: And. 680 de (Engel,) duce is used only when compounded, (see Engelbr., Andr. Index, 411.)

Plautus always uses the full form, and without regard to its position. Bacch.

(See Ritschl 2, 545; Rhein. Capt 356; Lorenz Most. 830)

Adverbs &c.

Adel, 2, 3, 11) vel pote supra "vel pote" pro potis et magis pro magis δραστικῶς,

Vel pote is rare but classic — very frequent in Donatus himself. Of course "pote pro potis" is meant.

Terence uses potis before forms of esse beginning with a vowel — pote before consonants (Engelbr, p. 26) — in every case with a verb.

In Plautus on the contrary potis occurs nearly 60 times by itself (see Lorenz Plaud. 877; Brix Trin 352; Men 625, Ter Hergil, Catull, Cicero de Orat 2, 98,)

Magis is frequent in Plautus but does not occur in Terence; Eunuch 4, 8, 1; 5, 1, 2, 3 etc, Of derivs to neg, 4, 1c, 4, 11, who gives magis forms Cicero's "Primentaria"

Pharm. 1, 1, 2) Heri ad nec

"Praeter cognationem et et lit-
teraeum non debituerunt an-
tiqui et hene et heri dicere et
mane et mani et vespere et ve-
peri"

For hene and heri cf. Enn. 1, 7, 11
Ennius (N. i. 202, 11 : Prise. 10 11 P ;
[illegible] ; Plaut. Pseud. 1, 2, 15 ; Merc.
4, 2, 37 &c ; Ter. Eun. 1, 2, 3 & 89 ; Haut
3, 2, 8. (with mane) ; Hor. an. (Non. 73, 33)
Lic. Fam 11, 1, 1 ; Ref 3, 31 &c. ; Ovid
Fast. 2, 76 (a quotation)

Hene occurs a few times in Plaut
us, once in Cicero (Att 10, 13, 1) and
after the Augustan period is per-
haps most frequent.

Mane is the form for classic pro-
For instance compare Plautus mane

2, 2, 80; "Nemini ad nefas" with Duncan, Lucr. 18; "Nemini nefas ad nefas." Nemo also occurs in the older writers as Donatus says; e.g. Plaut Per. 1, 3, 33; Ter. Pharm. 3, 2, 46; Hand 1, 1, 1V &c. (De Sonenz Most V 34; Prud. 37V; Holtze 1, 106)

Nec nefas & nefasi compare the Relat to Hand, 1, 1, 1V (Herm. 2, 364) Holtze 1, 105)

Plaut Pseud. 2, 3, 62; Mil. 2, V, 29 Rud. 1, 2, 91; Ter. And. 4, 4, 29; Cic. de Orat 2, 3, 12 &c; Lucr. B. 6. 1, 20.

Pharm. V, 1, 19) Ex composito.

Die utinam, Nav; 'ex composito' [illegible] (V, 2, 12 9)

Ex composito; Gell, Noct 2, 12; Livy 1, 9, 10; V, 14, 2; 36, 2V, 1 &c; Suet,

Edmund, 37; Tac. H. 4, 66 &c,
composito in much more rare,
Prop. 4, 2, 129; Virgil Aen. 6, 6,
4, Heinsius.

Eun. 2, 3, 18) Plenum omnem,
Et hae plenae et hic plenae et
haec plenae utrique dicendi,
Compare Gell. 4, 1, 2; Charis. (K.
1, 74, 28; Prisc. 1, 586; Lorenz,
Plaud. 587 acc. to whom plenus va-
ried at all periods both in form
and gender;
Nisus, Plaut Pseud 173; Capt 771 &c
Nauter; Pseud 222; Terminine
Lucilius (Non. 219, 29)

Eun. 4, 3, 12) Alliteration — quisquam
"Quisquam, quia qualquam dicebant
obscuriorem est" It would seem as
if the scholiast had an idea that

"illarum" was a sufficient indication of gender without altering the form of quisquam.

The next note is the first:—

"[illegible] praeterea etiam plerisque generibus proprium est in numeris (cf And. V, V, 25 "aperite aliquis ostium" under "Const. acc. to sense") have pronounced infinitive" The Schol. Bemb. 1st hand to Eun. V, V, 11 (Hauw. 2, 361) reads:— "quisquam ideo dixit, quia maiores nostri, 'quis' et 'ris' dicebant et 'mulier', ideo dixit 'quisquam'. Deberat enim dicere 'quemquam'."

The comment in the Donatus notes to the same passage seems to be merely a brief statement of the preceding. All he says is: "Antiqua locutio est."

Compare Schol. Bob. 3. 2. 2 3, (369 ed. 2. 385) reporting, it will be noticed, to Enn. 4. 4. 11 already quoted.

In Hec. 2, 1, 19 Donatus reads vestrorum according to his note. The text is uncertain.

Quis, quae, quae, quis quae, quaenam as feminine forms are antiquated. No examples of pene, aliquis and requis are to be quoted.

Quis as a feminine is more frequent in the old drama than qua.

It was originally universal, but as early as Plautus qua was well established, and soon afterwards became the only form.

The stripes in nota ge is shown by the next stanza, as far as I have been able to discover, quis &c, are never used as feminines under

there is some peculiarity used in the sentence by which the true gender of the pronoun may be immediately known.

(See Charisius, 4, 2, 2; Diomed 2, 449; Keil 1, 391; 401; 405 sqq., Priscian 362.)

5. Epicene.

Nouns.

Eun. 4, 4, 4/ Quid istic mutatis? Dic istunc. Penitus in Trinummo (3, 2, 83); Caecilius; Ἀπτὰ Τορέντῃ: "Quid tibi accepto &c."

Verbal substantives in -io having a position between the infinitive and the noun were a peculiar characteristic of the "Sermo vulgarius." The enormous use of them by Donatus himself is no apology

that examples are not necessary.
They are often used in questions
implying wonder or impatience,
Plaut. Amphit. 1.3.21: Asin. V. 2. 70;
Men. V. 7. 27 &c. With esse they
often took the place of the simple
infinitive (Plautus Pœn. V. 2. 36
&c.), often they approach the
gerundive in meaning (Plautus
Pseud 1704c.). The person concerned
is put in the dative and the whole
phrase is treated as a verb transi-
tive or intransitive.
(See Brix. Trin. 709; Nast. 377;
Forcng, Most. 6.)

Hec. Ph. 1. 1. 1) "Heccyra est hicine
nemo". Nominativo eum
figurarit quem in usu dixit ut
dativo dicamus; gerundivum formet

dint exemplo quidem utimur pro omnino pro certo hac gemino locutionis discriminandi,"

Quantus' testimony would show, that Keegrae in his time was more common than Keegra (Cp. Schmalz p. 278, 82 note)

"In the phrase: "mihi est nomen te," the dative of the name in the rule in old Latin — in Cicero and Caesar, the nominative. In Sallust, always the dative, Livy and Curtius prefer it, Velleius is first to use the genetive; the dative only with adjectives in Tacitus with whom the nominative is the rule — rarely the genetive, (Nipp. Ann. 2, 16, 1 Draeg. 1, 434; Kühn. 308.)

Ed. of Terence now write: "Ke

market", that is, the dative case, to the older usage. Dousterdieck's mistake in reading "Hecyra est" for "Hecyra est" is easily explained.

Hec. 1, 2, 118) Dic est,
'ἀρχαίως 'dicit' non 'dictum est'
dixit. Compare note to Hecyra
v. 3, 2.
Two things are to be noticed here;
the one example of "ἀρχαίως" for
the usual "ἀρχαιτρόπως", "notione
decebant" &c. and the reference
to a usage largely post-classical.
The ablative of time instead of
the accusative is common in
the familiar speech, scanty
examples of it occur as early as
Cicero, Caesar and Sallust,
often in Livy and Tacitus. In

the Spanish Inscriptions, the Ecclesiastical writers &c. the ablative of time is unclassical.
(See Donat Hec. 3, 4, 47; Serv. Verg. A. 1, 47; Schmalz 262, 54 n. 2)

Verbs.

Adel. 4, 2, 11) Etiam tacc.
Antiqua pro tacc., sic in Andria 5, 2, 8 (cp. Donat ad loc.), Ad Pherm. 3, 3, 9, are the remains of a rule probably on this same subject.
Etiam is often used thus in familiar language, with the imperative and impatient questions it belongs especially to Plautus and Terence.
(See Forcellini Most. 383; Holtze 2, 342 f. M.)

Eun. 4, 7, 29) Cave sis

"Divia imperativa verba dicunt ut
dicat continuliata addicunt vitio
vocem 'div' quod significat 'dei vim,'
Plaut, Stich, 1, 1, 130; Asin, 2, 2,
43; Trinum, 3, 2, 163; Poen, V, 2, 63 [illegible]
Par, Epid. 5, 2, 20; Cic. Tusc. 1, 1,
42; Rosc. Am. 16, 48; Mil, 22, 60;
Liv 34, 32, 20. (quot, from speech)
(See Koltze 2, 371 -h,)

And, 4, 4, 26) Per Div deiove
"Eloquentiae, die divine veteres pro
'deiov' dixere." The present par-
ticiple with [illegible] is rare. This for-
mula is most frequent in Ter
comic writers,
Plaut, Poen, V, 2, 78; Ter, And, 3, 2, 38,
(See Koltze 2, 5; Draeg, 1, 292)

Eun, 1, 2, 1) Dominae [illegible]

"Hic distinguunt;" quid fraudatur
alteri intelligunt?" Hic; "alteri te
intelligunt quid intersit?" [illegible]
add, I quia hic [illegible]
[illegible]."

Hic evidently refers to the personal use of interest (Cf note to Adel, 1, 1, 51)

Cp. Plaut, Most. 2, 1, 62; Pers. 4, 2, 44; Bell. 3, 14, 4 fin.

(See Holtze 1, 21; Draeg. 1, 167; Stat. Most. 407)

Adel, V, 8, 5) Ita nobis decet.

"Ita qui, si addebant statim ut, bene 'nos decet facere, nos decet dicere'! si non addebant, 'nobis decet' aut [illegible]" simpliciter dicebant; [illegible] Draeg. 1, 1, 5, etc.

Grammarians have stated the rule for

old Latin; that is, for Plautus, [illegible] Terence, [illegible] Lucretius, Sallust (?), and even Appuleius.

(Az. Adel. 491; Koltze 1, 278.)

Adel. 2, 3, 1) "Incerta distinctio est; "cum est apud accipere beneficium" vel "cum beneficium est apud." Hoc retro est, illud communiter."

The personal construction, nom. of thing needed, with apud est, afore-est and the like, in generally speaking ante-classic,

Cato R. R. III, 1; [illegible]; Ad. 1, [illegible], 4; Plaut. Capt. 1, 2, 61; Rud. 1, 2, 30; Truc. 4, 4, 20; Asin. 1, 1, 104; Cist 4, 2, 56 &c. Ter. Adel. 3, 2, 37; Hec. 4, 4, 43; Phorm. 3, 3, 24; Haut 5, 1, 20; Rud. 2, 1, 37;

4, 4, 1 ff.,

Pro- Rom. 1, 6, 1; 16, 2, 2 ff.; Cinq 1, 41, 1; 30, 30, 11; 37, 18, 10,

Phorm. 2, 1, 52) Functus officium Et nota; "Functus officium accusativo casu quod non ablativo,

In older Latin, and in Terence, fung [illegible]

In Adel. 603 the accus. is to be preferred (Fleck.). The construction is also to be found in Varro, Nepos, Tacitus, Suet, Appul, and Sulp. Sev, - in the latter regularly in the phrase "diem fungi"

(Cf. Az. Phorm. 281; Kaltz 1, 277 f. 285; Schmalz 280 n. 2; Brix, Trin. 1,)

The school, on "meta utentur" (Adel. V. 3, 29) (Heinrich 2, 399,) also

belongs here,
Here the usage of Terence varies between the accus. and ablative,
The construction is frequent in Plautus but rarer in Terence and Cato. With the accus. of gerund, the usage is classic though especially frequent in Plautus,
(Ktz, Stamm. 2 81; Lehmann 2 [illegible] 2, 1; Woltze 1, 270; 276; 285; Brix Trin. 1,)
Adel. 5, 4, 17) Patria potitus,
"Accentatio cum accusativo quod non additur [illegible]
Compare note to Adel, Ter. Heaut. 1, 3, 278.
Potior with the accus. does not occur in Cicero but in Bell. Hisp. 7, Afr. Bell. Fac. Hisp. Bell. Alex. Bell.

δεῖ, from which it may be
inferred that the use of the
acc. is not from the D. T.

Andria 1, 1, 79 / Metui a Chryside.
"Ἀρχαϊκὸς ἐστί,"
Cf. Schol. Haut 3, 2, 20 (Hermes
2, 376)
Either the Scholiast, which is hardly
possible, looks upon the evident a-
mission of quid as an archaic el-
-lipsis in other words or else
he understands that the entire
dependencies of metui are expressed
in the words "a Chryside". This
it is [illegible], is
misconception.

Hec. 4, 1, 19 / Eum illo nupta,
"Antiqui non illi nupta sed cum

[illegible] nuptum [illegible]."
[illegible] Bue. 4, 4, 24) "[illegible]
nuptum' dixit."
Plaut. Amphit. prol. 99; Asin. V. 2, 20;
Rep. Pharm. V. 3, 34; 2, 1, 74;
(See Holtze 1, 96.)

Pharm. 1, 3, 2) "Ubi in meritum civem
adventi venit."
"Nota 'venire in meritum' utrem non
recordationis causa tantum sed
etiam [illegible] sed
nisque postulasse." Then a second
note: "Sic veteres genetivo casum
frequentant;" in meritum a-
[illegible] "Cicero (Rep. 1, 11, V.)
The first remark seems to depend
entirely upon the passage,
"In meritum venire" with the geni-
tive is mostly Ciceronian:—

Plaut, Rud, 685; Cic. Quint, 2, 6; De Orat, 2, 61, 249; Fin, 5, 1, 2; Trans, 7, 3, 1 &c.

Pharm, 1, 4, 11) Examinat Animi, "τῷ ἰδιωτικῷ φησὶ τὸ quod est; propter Antiphonem nec exercito animo. Sic in Hegym (1, 2, 46) Genetivo enim casu utitur figura dant hanc locutionem,"

Compare Donat, Heaut, 4, 4, 1; Eun, 2, 2, 43; Hero, Hec, 4, 1, 14; 1, 96,

On account of the use of animi in the plural (Cic Fl. D, 1, 4C, 96) Dracy, thinks animi in these expressions was originally an ablative form, Cicero does not use animi with Agitare — sometimes with the verb ago and perdere but more frequently the ablative

Caesar uses neither form, and
especially Tacitus carries the us-
age further.
(cp. Koltze 1, 331; Schmalz §. 269;
Draeg. 1, 411, 5.)

Even §. 61, 17) haec urna confodienda,
die in Ptiorm. (V, 8, 54), erant et
dona ablativo casui ingebant
notiones, condono nero accusati-
ne."
Compare donat, Ptorm. V, 8, 54,
As is shown by Draeger (1, 358)
this category belongs to the free
use of the accusative in
Latin.
With dono the ablative of the
thing is the reigning construction,
with two accusatives: Hec. V, 4, 9,
Condono with two accusatives

occurs as follows:—
Plaut Bacch. 5, 2, 34; Persa
5, 2, 36; Ter Phorm. 5, 8, 54; Enn
fr. ad. 17 and Hor. (Nor. 497, 29)
(Lu Dziatzko Phorm. 947;
Holtze 1, 286; Krueger 1, 358)

Adel. 4, 5, 32) Sui illa (Dz. 666)
consuevit
"legitur et "illam" ut dicebant
veteres; "hanc rem consuevit" &c;
[illegible]
in antiquissimis ante post frequentius,
Lucret. 6, 397; Cat. 6, 2, 9; Ter. 1, 5,
; Virg. A. 4, 17, 10, 15, 16.

Enn. 2, 1, 16) Nimis ne indulgeo
"ne, dicebant veteres quod nos, mi-
hi dicimus. Alibi; (Plaut 5, 2, 35)
[illegible]

[illegible] with accus. of the
person in anticlassic and poetic
(Hymn. (A. 170), Gr. Gramm. 1, p.
35; Lucil., Praef. 1. (passive);
Lucil. (Mar. 4, 246,)
(See Haltz 1, 284)

Enn. 2, 2, 31 / discere de nec,
magis 'de illo' et 'de nec' interest
dicebant quam nos dicimus
"a nec" aut "ab illo".
This is a point which might well
bear further investigation.
De for ab seems to have been a
peculiarity of the familiar lang
uage. In spite of its frequency for
ab the final survival of de in
the Romance languages is well
known.
Livy de nec; Lucil. Plaut.

Enuere de; Cato R. R. 1, 4; Neuere de; Cic Flacc. 101 oflin; queuere de; Cic. Att. 1, 14, 2; Audire de; Cic. De Orat. 3, 33, 139; Petere de; Nota Tir. Fpp. III. 6, 174, 1074; Exuere — Vell. 4, 12, 4 3 5; otherwise a or ab.

(Schmalz, 394 for 137; Draeger i, 1, 625 f.; Holtze 1, 56 ff.)

Eun prol. 45) "Quid sibi — velit," "Ἡρχιόμην, velit sibi"; ut alibi; (Haut 1, 1, 7, 1

This is a conversational usage, rare in the best Augustan writers, but to be met with in all periods, Plaut Asin. prol. 6; Poen. 1, 1, 24; Ter. Eun. 4, 7, 28; 4, 7, 34; 3, 5. 11; 5. 6, 6; And. 2, 3, 1; 2, 6, 26; Haut 1, 1, 9; Pharm. 5, 8, 53; Cic. Orat. 2, 67, 269;

[illegible] Ne. 1, 47 : [illegible] 4, 67, 7 : [illegible] Men. 4, 1, 6 : [illegible] 1, 16, 2, 4.

Abl. 1, 2, 47) "de [illegible]," but Vergilius : (1, 2, 719). Horatius has "arbiter" :

Plaut. Amphit. prol. 53 : Aul. 4, 5, 6 ; Capt. [illegible], 2, 40 : [illegible], 1 51 ; Most. 1, 3, 66 ; Mil. 2, 2, 45 ; Pseud. 1, 3, 116 ; Ter. And. 2, 6, 25 ; Haut. 1, 1, 56 ; Phorm. 5, 6, 42 ; Hec. 4, 2, 23 ; 4, 4, 78 ; Adel. 3, 3, 83 ; 4, 1, 22 ; 5, 3, 57 !

In the comic writers the future is often replaced by the present for greater vividness,

(See Spengel And. 381 ; Brix, Capt. 293 ; Lor. Most. 687 ; Dz. Adel. 127 ; P. Thomas, Syntax des futurs [illegible] de Ter. 1878 ; [illegible], 8 : Waltz 2, 86, par. 13,)

Add. 4, 5, 47) Velim,

"Velim autem pro volo antiquae dictum"

Potential velim for volo occurs often in Cicero. It is especially frequent in the comic writers and occurs to a greater or less extent throughout the literature.

(In Koltz, 2, 138; Draeg. 1, 306)

Quoniam &c,

And. 3, 2, 46) Multo maximum est,

"Multo etiam comparativi augent adiumentum."

Compare note to Phorm. prol. 11; Ashby (Cl. J. 206, 4)

In old Latin the comparative and superlative were often strengthened by multo,

Once in Terence; (Ad. 738); but

open in the first Persian [illegible],
Appuleius &c.
("Cf. note to Phorm. final. 11; Charis.
(K. 1, 206, 4: Keltz 2, 206: Schmalz,
p. 372, 11, 6")

Andria 3, 3, 13)"— atque alias cum dubare
Nos dicimus 'cum dubare', Merg,
(A. 4, 971. Compare Lionel, (K. 1,
92, 3ff.)
'Olim' here, has its original mean-
ing of a demonstrative adverb giving
a more exact time to the following cum,
Rare in later literature: Merg,
A. 8, 391; Lucret. 6, 148 &c.
Sometimes cum with the present
indicative is used, Ind. 309 &c,
In old Latin cum with the indic
ative is the rule. The subjunctive
comes in about A. U. C. 700.

In Later Latin the imperfect subj. is used, but not regularly. (Ter. And. 883; Plaut. Asin. 906 &c.) (Terence, four exx only; — And. 1, 1, 69; 3, 3, 13; Eun. 2. 3. 19; Ph. 2. 3. 7.)

(See Prin. 523; Eckf. Silbert Gramm. Stud. f. 72 + 69, 1; Kottz 2. 3 ff.; Par. Müller 1, 1, 2; Spengel, Andr. 545; Draeger 2, 544 (a).)

And. 3. 3. 11) Ne me obsecra. "Pro ne me obsecres" &c, Cf. Donat. And. N. 2. 27 and especially: Heaut. 4. 6. 544. Ne with the imperative belongs to the people and is not used by the classic writers, who only give two examples: (Draeg. Hist. St. 1, 164; H. N. 3, 129.)

(See Schmalz 289, 37; Weitz 2, 136; Krug. 1, 328.)

Kee, 3, 1, 33,) "Fortasse — concipe" sic Plautus;(—), Num veteres infinitivo modo adiungebant 'fortasse'.

This elliptical use of fortasse like forsan with a subject clause belongs to Plautus and Terence, Plaut mine. 4, 4, 42; Asin. 1, 1, 24; Epid. 2, 2, 111; Poen. V. 2, 61; Truc. 3, 2, 12; Cic Leg. 2, 7, 17, (Weitz 1, 265 ff 268; &c)

Pharm, fr val. 1) Post quam fuerit. Nota fore quum apud veteres non fracte, ito modo sed etiam praeterit. tempora adiungi solet, Krug, (E. 1, 30),"

Evidently from the same
horizon in the Aetol. to the
same purpose (Herm. 2, 376).
Parataxis with the pronoun
is not infrequent in the
comic writers — apteron ἄ
very rare, Cic. Nat. D. 1, 103 ἃ e,
It belongs to the "S. V."
(See Ladew. Proxy 22, 1, 1.; Anti
Garb. 889; Draeg. 2, 384.)

III. General remarks.

1. Derivation.

In the department of etymology,
Donatus, like most other Latin gram-
marians, is a broken reed. How-
ever, I have quoted some derivations
that he quotes from "the ancients,"

And. 3, 2, 11 / "In tanem idem

"Idem abundat, (πάλιν again!)
Then we have the curious note;
"Apud veteres 'tamen idem' in
integrum fuit; unde apud nos
tandem et tamen natum est,"
"Sic et 'idem eorumque' dictum."
For 'integrum' editions earlier
than Klotz have 'negotium' which
must have crept in from the 'ne-
goti' in the text. So far as
I can discover, the commentator
understands 'tamen idem' to be
the original form of which "tandem"
is the fusion and ordinary 'tamen'
the first half. The writer of
'sic — dictum' derives eorundem
from 'idem eorumque' unless
we take the common reading men-
tioned by Klotz; 'sic et eorundem
&c, in which case eorundem is in

[illegible]

Adel. 2, 1, 28) Lara is [illegible] from Lamia, with a romantic note of explanation.

Adel. 3, 3, 5) "Natorem genuum meritorium tabernam diverunt ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνῶν quod [illegible] in terra te,"

Phorm. 1, 2, 57) Parma is connected with ferrar, formax and forceps. (See Teuber Progr. Eberswalde (1911) 4, 11)

Phorm. 3, 3, 4, ἵ' Comitem' veteres dixerunt παρὰ τὸ κόσμος,"

[illegible]

(107.)

he does better,

"meridiem dixerunt veteres
quasi medidiem = quod de posito
propter coquationem horarum
inter se litterarum."

Varro, L. L. 6. 4; Fic. Orat. 47;
158; Quintil. 1. 6. 30; Prisc. 575
8

Compare however Stolz but Gramm.
174. 5, with references there given,
From medidies we should rather
get medies than meridies,
the original form is better;
medi die "Am hellen Tage"
(Stowasser Archiv 1, 273; Heraeus
Jahrb. Büch. 117, 74.)

2. Orthography &c.

Eun. Prol. 10) In the same,
"Thesaurum Latini veteres ac-

cuiusmodi Graecos dicit in litteris frequentabant."

This statement, of course, needs to be exactly reversed. A consideration of the original Greek word was probably a cause of the statement.

Stolz (I 3, 17) says: the frontal new growth of the nasal n before s is shown in words like thensaurus etc. Its omission belongs to low or very late Latin. In the early language its omission is customary in a few words and sometimes, in inscriptions.

Acc. plur. 2, IV) Remnotum, "deminuit m secundum antiquos qui omnes in verbis diligenter duplicabant." Compare ne-

Suet. Pharm. 12, 'collection'.
These cases are not so much doubling as assimilation of the original d in ned,
The suppression of the d may account for the frequent lengthening of nc. in the fonts,
(Buchm. Fuent f. 203; Dz. Phorm. 21)

Adel. 3.3.69) Quod quico :—
"N coquendo omnfoit πασόρεσον :
then after mentioning Cicero's celebrated pun 'te quoque' (cf. Fuint, 6.3.47) he adds :— "nam apud veteres coquus non per c litteram sed per q. describuntur."
(Bu Stolz f. 171 par. 48)

Ker. 1.2.7) Sura
"Sura veteres dixerunt V pro Y pro

mentions set 'Mentes', 'Dentia',
& Incus, Pist. 4.7.100 shows that
in his time (c. 160 A.D.) the
power of the older orthography.
(See Italy p. 181.)

So much for the archaisms of
Terence mentioned by Donatus,
& was intended at the start, all
these comments have been con-
sidered which expressly mention
some ancient usage as such.
Doubtless the number of Terence
cases would be greatly increased
if we had the original commentary
of Donatus, with his keen and,
generally correct appreciation of
an archaism, which it is hoped
has been shown in the preceding pages.

it I is hardly to be supposed that forms like these forms, implying in-ier and the like should have been passed over without any comment as to their character.

Hence I should say provisionally, that such notes as give a translation of these forms were brief registrations of comments which were [illegible] of more extended character.

(Compare, e.g. Andr. V, 4, 21) "Lucretius"; Eun 1, 2, 84) "Claudius"; Adel, 1, 2, 36) "Illi"; Andr. V, 1, 13) "tetulit" &c, &c,) But as such remarks fall outside the purpose and scope of the present paper, they have not been considered in detail.

That we shall ever recover the original commentary of Donatus is of course, out of the question, but

I can hardly agree with Hahn that scarcely, if any, traces of it remain. From the very beginning its integrity has been seriously interfered with, because it was always, and perhaps justly, considered merely as a practical aid to the interpretation of Terence not as a monument, to be preserved in its entirety. The most serious evils which have overtaken it may be stated in a word as [illegible]

There is much that is useless and even nonsensical in the commentary. "Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura" The author's distinctions are often imaginary – his synonyms will

not bear the test of actual usage, but as have been shown in the preceding pages, most of the remarks on archaisms (all except Aul. 2, 1, 22 Eun. 1, 2, 9; Pharm. 1, 3, 5; 2, 1, 83 (?); 5, 1, 16; Hec 1, 2, 7; And. 1, 1, 79; Adel Prol 1, 1; And. 1, 5, 16), whatever their author or authors may be, bear the light of modern learning in the sense that they are proof of reasonable help to the study and appreciation of the older Latin literature.

Rare words, &c,

In examining the commentary of Donatus I have noted a large number of rare and peculiar words, of which it is proposed to treat in a future paper, more at length. Here, hardly more will be attempted than to briefly call attention to some of the most noticeable forms, (There is a report of an article on this subject by Dr. Warren, in the Johns Hopkins Circ. for which I have not been able to procure.)

The following are words which I do not find elsewhere:—

Abanctiones,

(Of "punctiuncula" Gramd. 4, 1, 9; 4, 2, 11.)

Auto-nomastice, of book writing

Keil, 1, 2, 5 "mos alterius et nostrum nostica nomen repetit."

Liddell & Scott do not give the adjective ἀντοκρατορικός from which
antonomastice were derived,

Argumentationes
(Com. Nl. 18, 12) as a translation for
ὑποθετικός,

Assimulator,

And. 1, 2, 4 — assimulator et calidus,

Auctiones,

Hec. 2, 2, 26 auctionem et; Pharm.
1, 4, 26.

Cogitationes,

Pharm. 2, 1, 10; cogitationes mentis,

Commachinari,

Pharm. 1, 4, V; docuit et commachinatus artifex fortis,

Comprehensor,

Eun. 3, V, 1, "Ne quis novus
comprehensor recurrat,

Comeitia

Adel. V, 3, 3, "irati omnia con-
cita faciunt.

Conventus

Hec. 1, 2, 34, "Duae negotium fa-
ciunt mihi contentionem.
(Ed. Vent hier 'confessionem',)

Conservocinatio

Arg. Adel. 6, V. (accus. sing.)

Consignificatio

Adel. 3, 2, 1, (accus. sing.)

Corruptivus

Adel. 3, 4, 6; V, 1, 10; V, 4, 13.

Cunctative

Eun. V, 1, 7, Cunct, gramuntiunda,

Curratio

Hec. 3, 1, 3V, ad eorum fidem.

Departator

Eun. 4, 7, 1, dehort, sese certum nunc

Desolutrix

Hec. 1, 2, 84, muse, fem. Plaut Trin 2, 1, 18

Cod. Th. 16, 2, 28.

Dextramanitus

And. 5, 3, 5 — dextramanitus [illegible]

Adel. 6, 7, 6 ; 7, 3, 18.

Diventinc

Ecm. 1, 2, 46. [illegible]

Dvicctio

Adel, 5, 8, 2 [illegible] dvicctio

Dissidiosus

Nec. 4, 3, 11 — dissidiosa conjunctio

Epitacin

Arg. Adel. 4, 1, Nec. 113, 1 (116) ; Arg. Pharm. 361, 17 ; And, 3, 5 ; Arg, Ecm, 217 10, "ἐπίτροπον" ; Donat Conred, 18, 7 ; 18, 20;

Exceptine,

Nec. 4, 3, 2. [illegible]

Expatine

Adel. 5, 2, 1 [illegible]

Exsecrule

Ecm. 5, 2, 64 [illegible]

Lentiendum

Eun. 5, 1, 62,

Improditrix

Hec. 4, 4, 72,

Incorruptibilis —

And. 1, 2, 18 — de muliere,

Incuriosus —

Eun. 4, 1, 11 — tractemur,

Insultantes —

Eun. 5, 4, 4,

Interlocutiuncula,

Eun. 2, 2, 32, — longae orationi

interlocutiuncula quaedam adhibenda,

Laudatiuncula,

Eun. 5, 8, 5, — dicere

Materne

Hec. 4, 2, 18 — atque amabiliter,

Naritus

Adel. 3, 3, 43 — (cf. gnaritus)

Narrationes

Eun. 4, 7, 1 — 5, 4, 20

Abiungales,

Enn. 7, 7, 4. [illegible]

tamquam in uno sit quod minus est.

Obtorneo,

Enn. 4, 7, 15, obtornatur adulescens &c.

Ornutinus,

Fab. 3, 2, 6; Enn. 5, 4, 3,

Parasitica,

Pharm. 2, 2, 13; 2, 2, 22,

Perambulatio,

Adel. 4, 6, 3 whence perruptatio, also

Percontatrix,

Hec. 1, 2, 102, Not ever quoted for

a form percontator,

Perruptatio,

Adel. 4, 6, 3, (or perruptor)

Perspicacia

Enn. 5, 4, 11 — perspicacius

Persuasorius

Enn. 5, 8, 37,

Fictis

Eun. 4, 5, 6, a fictis rationibus.

Frabbandior, Hec. 4, 2, 9,

Precatorius, Phorm. 1, 2, 92 — unv.

Prominentia, Heaut. 1, 1, 1; Phor. 1, 2, 7; 1, 3, 10

Relabor, Phorm. 3, 2, 18. (cf. relabor)

Remora, Eun. 2, 3, 10. Ne remora fuerimus quin et ἐξ ἀγορᾶς veniamus.

Renationes, Hec. 2, 2, 21; 4, 4, 3; Ph. 2, 1, 1.

Reflectit, Eun. 3, 2, 8, non rev, sed absolute posuit &c,

Rhinthonica (comoedia) Heaut. prol. 7; de comoed. 17, 32,

Ruditer, Eun. 3, 1, 15.

Satirice, Eun. 2, 2, 1

Similitudinarie. (?) And. 4, 5, 17

Sonatur, Hec. 2, 1, 15; Ph. prol. 2,

Subambigue (?) Phor. 4, 4, 2

Dedependo, And. 5, 3, 2 5. culpam.

Dubdistinctio, Eun. 3, 3, 2.

Dubindigrantes, Adel. 1, 2, 2.

Dubindignor, Hec. 3, 5, 46.

Dubsultatio. Adel. 2, 4, 1.

Duppalpatio. And. 4, 4, 47 "malicious"
(Ed. Rom. "suppalpistatio".)

Tardiloquium, Hec. 5, 1, 15.

Tegiculum Pharm. Prol. 26.

Temperculum, And. 4, 2, 27 (excl. 'dicendi')

Ultrinsecus, apparently 4c in foregoing in Donatus:— Eun. 5, 2, 63.: Adel. 3, 3, 76.: 3, 4, 53: 4, 5, 27: 5, 8, 28: Hec. 4, 3, 6.: 4, 4, 66: Pharm. 1, 1, 15.

Of words only quoted from Ericus in the lexicon I note:—

Accommodate. And. 4, 4, 13.

Admirabiliter And. 4, 2, 11.

Affabiliter. Arg. Adel. 6, 18.

Auditio n, Hec. 4, 4, 14, [illegible]

Comprobatio, And, 5, 3, 11

Cautio, Adel 1, 3, 6 [illegible] Hec 4, 2, 1.

Veteratoria Pharm, 2, 3, 14, quoted from Cic Orat 1, 39 and the [illegible] example. So of:-

Initium, Comed, 2, 1, 1, Ter. Ad. 5, 4, 6.

Duodetonachum, Hec, 1, 2, 101; Aug, Conf. 3, 12,

Semigravis, Eun, 4, 5, 1, Liv 25, 24, 2,

Adlundabilis Ph, 1, 4, 26 Plaut, Pers, 4, 5, 1.

Decuplavit, Eun, 1, 2, 103; Decuplatio a term in quoted as occurring once in Inventio 3, 437.

Sacerdicus Adel, 5, 3, 63; Ter, Phorm, 1, 1, 6

These are a few of the most important words. A better text of the commentary is much needed

however before a really satisfactory study of them can be made.

Nouns of verbal nouns in -io — adverbs in -ter — adjectives in -ivus &c these seem to compose the bulk of St Matt's vocabulary, the vocabulary of one who always desires to condense as much as possible into brief statements. He seems to have more words in common with Cicero and Quintilian than anyone else but doubtless this may be laid to the rhetorical subjects in both cases, with its inevitable coincidence of vocabulary.

Sometimes we meet with terms peculiar to Ecclesiastical Latin but almost never with archaisms. He avoids them apparently though the community has suffered so much alteration &c. that it is

hardly [illegible] to write [illegible]
[illegible] on this style.

(165)

Life.

I was born in the little town of Pawlet in the State of Vermont on the 6th of December 1862. Since my 6th year my home has been at Rutland in the same state.

I entered the public schools of that place at the age of ten where I passed through the usual course of study necessary as a preparation for College.

In the Autumn of 1880 I entered the University of Vermont at Burlington and was graduated from there as a Bachelor of Arts in 1884. Many instructors in Latin which I had now decided to make my work in life was Prof. John E. Goodrich, for whose kind counsel and [illegible] ing interest in my welfare I shall always be grateful.

After a year at home, I came to the Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore, where I remained three years, during which time I was engaged in the study of Latin, Greek and Sanskrit.

I cannot close this sketch more appropriately than by expressing my hearty thanks to Professors Gildersleeve, Warren and Bloomfield for all the advice, encouragement and, above all, inspiration which they have so freely given me.

Kirby Williams Smith

Baltimore April 1889.